

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XXI, No. 1.

JULY 1941

ST. GEORGE'S CATHEDRAL, SOUTHWARK

AN HISTORICAL RETROSPECT

WRITING an obituary notice is never a very cheerful task. Still less when, as on this occasion, it takes the form of recounting the history of a splendid church that has been suddenly and violently destroyed. But the writer of this record of St. George's Cathedral, which perished through "enemy action" in the early hours of the morning of 17 April last—the very centenary year of the laying of its foundation stone—is at least consoled by the firm belief of very many that the Mother-Church of the Diocese will, like the fabled phoenix, rise again from its own ashes, and continue the magnificent work of which it has so long been the centre. In a sense, the circumstances of the recent calamity may be compared with the destruction of the Catholic chapels in Edinburgh and London in the time of Bishop Hay and Bishop Challoner, owing to the Relief Act of 1778 and the anti-Catholic fury it inspired. To all appearances the labour of years was undone, yet we know that almost from that day commenced the great revival of the Faith in this land which is one of the spiritual phenomena of modern times. Fitly enough, St. George's Cathedral arose on the very site where Lord George Gordon's "No Popery" upheaval commenced—a lasting satire on that event, and yet another proof that God's work is never frustrated for long.

St. George's Cathedral, which may be regarded as the cradle of the Diocese of Southwark, like many other similar foundations, had the humblest of beginnings. In Bishop Challoner's time as Vicar Apostolic (1758-81) the Catholics of the Metropolis were estimated, generally, at about 10,000—a very conservative calculation we think—and these might have been divided into two classes, one "sma' but verra select", as the Scotsman said, consisting of the few Catholic peers, baronets and landed gentry who had houses in town—chiefly in Berkeley Square and Bloomsbury—the foreign ambassadors and their entourages, and a sprinkling of quite prosperous conveyancers, medical men (qualified abroad), merchants and tradesmen. The other and far larger class was made up of the daily toilers, chiefly Irish. These poor folk were very numerous in Whitechapel north of the Thames, and south of it in the even then overcrowded purlieus of Blackfriars Bridge and the borough of Southwark. There was a dirty lane in this truly Hogarthian locality, called by the quaint name of "Bandy-leg Walk", near the Blackfriars Road, which with Gravel Lane, Ewer Street and the adjoining courts and alleys made up "the St. Giles"-like quarter of the district. The presence of many Irish there seemed to demand a chapel, and the times were

growing more favourable, for the First Relief Act, that of 1778, had shown the goodwill of the Government. This promised something like lasting security. So in 1786 the Rev. Thomas Walsh, a zealous Douay priest, took the bold step, and that year a chapel, to be known as "The Irish Mass House", arose amidst the dingy tenements and squalid hovels of the place. Thirteen years before, the Rev. Gerard Shaw had bravely set the example of progress under difficulties by opening a similar kind of chapel at East Lane, Bermondsey, and the two lowly foundations came to stay. The new Mission in Southwark, in fact, took such firm root that the good founder was soon glad to avail himself of the assistance of the Rev. John Thayer. This latter priest was a native of Boston, U.S.A., and in the then recent War of Independence had, it is stated, served for a time as secretary to one of Washington's generals. Educated a Congregationalist he became a Catholic at Rome in 1782, and being conscious of a vocation studied at St. Sulpice, Paris, and was ordained a priest there in 1789. Coming to London he was appointed assistant to Father Walsh by Bishop Talbot, V.A. The Bishop was the brother of the Earl of Shrewsbury, and he is distinguished as being the last Catholic ecclesiastic to be tried for saying Mass in England (Old Bailey, February 1769). He was acquitted, for the presiding judge, Lord Chief Justice Mansfield, insisted on the informer, the notorious Payne, proving to the satisfaction of the Court that the accused was really a priest of the Church of Rome, and that he had actually said Mass. The judges of the King's Bench, Common Pleas and Exchequer had lately, under the advice of Lord Mansfield, a good friend to Catholics, come to a resolution on the two points mentioned above—a decision which ended prosecution for saying Mass in England. To resume. The Rev. J. Thayer infused new ideas and energy into the Mission. He collected a sum of money from the nobility and gentry, sufficient to open a commodious school for boys and girls, and was projecting other developments, when, to the deep regret of his congregation, and no doubt also of Bishop Douglass, V.A., he was recalled to the United States by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Carrol, first Bishop of the newly erected See of Baltimore.

The Baptismal Registers of the chapel date from 1788. In that year the number of children and adults baptized amounted to 79. In 1793 it was 93, and in 1796, 134. In 1790 the chapel was enlarged and re-decorated and re-opened for Divine Service on Passion Sunday. The Rev. James Barnard—an old Blue Coat boy of Christ's Hospital, London, and alumnus of the English College, Lisbon—the biographer and Vicar General of the late Bishop Challoner, preached at the Mass, which was celebrated by the Rev. Thomas Hussey, D.D. This last was one of the best known Catholic ecclesiastics of his time. A scholar, and well versed in Spanish literature and affairs, he was also the friend of Dr. Johnson, and later became first President of Maynooth (1795), and shortly afterwards Bishop of Waterford.

The second Relief Act (1791), and the freedom it afforded Catholic chapels and schools, did much indirectly to increase the number of the faith-

ful in Southwark, as elsewhere, and it was resolved to transfer the chapel from its old and unfashionable site to a more central and genteel locality. Even before this, in October 1788 to be precise, Bishop Talbot had already by circular appointed and authorized Messrs. Daniel Varley and Ings to make a collection amongst the Catholics of London, Southwark and the neighbouring places, for the purpose of building a new chapel in "the Borough of Southwark, and for the support of the present Chapel".

The result of the authorization was the erection of "the large and grand Chapel" in the London Road. The new building was designed by Mr. James Taylor, the future architect of Ushaw College, and the opening took place on Passion Sunday, 17 March, 1793. Bishop Douglass, V.A., the successor of Bishop Talbot, pontificated, the preacher on this happy occasion being Father Arthur O'Leary, the famous Capuchin Friar whose pulpit eloquence, of the style of Bossuet, always drew large congregations both of Catholics and Protestants. As a wit, he shone conspicuously in the polished circle that centred around the Prince of Wales, afterwards George IV. A repartee of the Friar to the Prince on one occasion, anent, "going farther and faring worse"—in support of the doctrine of Purgatory—caused great amusement at the time and has since become a kind of proverb.

A water-colour picture of the old chapel in the London Road preserved at Bishop's House shows what may be considered as typical of Catholic "places of worship"—that phrase so beloved by Pugin!—to be found in this country in those days. The interior is oblong, and fitted up with very plain benches, like an old-fashioned Nonconformist meeting-house. The pulpit on the Epistle side is not inelegant in shape, quite a relief, in fact, with its Sheraton panels and octagonal sounding-board. The galleries, so common during the Georgian period, are, of course, there, and the high altar with its tall Roman pattern candlesticks is much enhanced by a splendid picture of the Crucifixion, which seems to suggest the brush of Murillo. After the opening of the Cathedral in 1848 this picture was removed to St. Peter's, Woolwich, but was restored to St. George's in Bishop Danell's time. It hangs in the sacristy, unharmed, it is gratifying to be able to remark, by the recent fire.

A common earthenware bowl is reported to have served as a font for a number of years, a surely very unnecessary display of the simple life in matters ecclesiastical even for those days! It was replaced later by a stone font, which served its purpose at the Cathedral till about 1889, when it was given to the late Father Reeks of the (then) new Mission at Walworth, where it is still in use.

The exterior of the chapel, including the chaplain's house, was in keeping with the general severity of the rest of the structure, though adorned to some extent by a double row of yew trees which gave an air of rusticity to the place. Actually the country at that time was not far off. Kennington, Camberwell, Stockwell and Brixton Rise were then rural districts, where meadows, orchards and green fields made up the landscape. But the car of the

building Juggernaut, which started about 1780, rolled remorselessly on, and in forty years masses of houses and busy streets covered the once sylvan expanse.

"The large and grand Chapel", which in 1793 had appeared to many far too spacious for the congregation, had as early as 1814 become much too small. Between 1790 and 1830 the Catholic population, mainly owing to the building developments referred to, had increased to some 20,000. The only other chapel in the vicinity was at East Lane, Bermondsey, and the "parish" of that in the London Road extended for miles into Surrey. There was a domestic chapel at Mitcham which for many years divided the intervening pastoral work with the Southwark chaplains. This last-named chapel was that of "Elmwood", the residence of the Hon. Mrs. Langdale, whose husband's distillery on Holborn Hill was burnt down by the Gordon rioters. After the death of the priest, the Abbé Louis le Grippe, an *émigré*, in 1819, the Catholics of Mitcham were attended from St. George's until the opening of the local Mission in 1853.

Of course, more chapels was the obvious remedy for this shortage, but the missionary spirit engendered by the martyr priests of Douay had, it seemed, died out during the long era of "bloodless martyrdom" that followed and, although adequate funds do not appear to have been wanting, nothing in the way of progress was accomplished. Another influence, however, was fast becoming prominent. The minds of many were turning to the past and the long-forgotten Faith. The writings of Scott and Chateaubriand, and the questionings aroused by the agitation for Catholic Emancipation, were doing much to draw the attention of the more reflective section of the public to the claims of the ancient Church.

The Rev. Thomas Doyle, who came to the chapel as organist in 1820 and succeeded the Rev. Daniel MacDonnell as Senior Chaplain nine years later, was one of those who marked the new trend of thought and resolved to follow it. With him the "Ideal of a Christian Church" was one that recalled the glories of the Ages of Faith rather than the sad memories of civil and social repression which so long dominated the minds of his co-religionists in this country.

In 1837 an influential committee of three priests and eleven laymen was formed to commence the somewhat ambitious work of building a "grand Gothic Cathedral". Among the lay members were some very noteworthy names. First of these was the Hon. Edward Petre, M.P. for Ilchester, who did much to advance Catholic interests at the time, and who lives in the annals of the "Turf" as a triple winner of the "St. Leger". Another member, Mr. Bosanquet, belonged apparently to the great banking family of the name, while Mr. C. T. Pagliano, who also gave valuable service and support, was the proprietor of the then well-known Sablonière Hotel. Mr. James Kiernan, who seems to have acted as legal adviser to the committee, was a proctor or solicitor of the now long extinct Court of Doctors' Commons. His memory went back to the days of the Gordon riots, and he was in fact

a living storehouse of recusant lore. Once appointed, the committee set to work with a will. Weekly lists of contributors were posted up at the chapel doors, and meantime the prime mover had set out on the grand tour of Europe for the same purpose. Fr. Doyle obtained interviews with the great ones of the earth nearly everywhere, and large donations came to him from such exalted personages as the Emperor of Austria (presumably Ferdinand I, 1835-48), Leopold I, King of the Belgians, Queen Marie Amélie, consort of Louis Philippe, "the Citizen King", and Queen Christina of Spain. Not a few of the German Grand Dukes also gave liberal amounts. Presents in kind, too, were not wanting, and some of these must have aroused mingled feelings of joy and regret, for they consisted very often of gifts of chalices, vestments, and other "church stuff" from historic families at home that had "conformed" at some time or other during the penal days. Faith had died out and the great Sacrifice had long ceased in many a lordly castle and ancient hall, but these precious relics had not survived in vain. Once more they were to be in the service of the Church, a reminder to another generation of the sorrows of the past and so enabling it to look forward with confidence to a happier future.

Apart from the great financial consideration, the building of St. George's had another obstacle to face. The erection of one large and extremely costly church, when literally miles of new suburbs all around had neither chapels nor priests, seemed to many the height of folly, and who shall say that they were far wrong? The *Tablet* and other Catholic journals of the day teemed with pungent criticisms of a policy which, no doubt, did to a certain extent hinder for a time Catholic expansion in South London.

But there was to be no going back. On 26 May, 1841, the Feast of St. Augustine of Canterbury, the first stone of the building was laid with all becoming ceremony. The site chosen at the intersection of the St. George's new Road and the Lambeth Road was a good one. The cost of the ground, which was purchased from the Corporation of London through Mr. B. G. Hodges, one of the committee, was £3,200. The seven years that passed between "foundation" and "opening" must have seemed an age to the expectant congregation, and something of a purgatory to the committee, for the architect, the famous Augustus Welby Pugin, the high priest, almost, of the contemporary "Gothic Revival", was, like Lord George Murray of the '45, a man impatient of contradiction and given to sullen moods. But at length the work was well and truly done, and the day of the auspicious opening dawned, 4 July, 1848, in the year that saw Europe convulsed with revolution. The transferred Feast of St. Alban, proto-martyr of Britain, marked a red-letter day indeed in the annals of Catholic England. A gathering of the faithful unequalled since the break with Rome hailed the opening of the new Cathedral, graced as it was by five of the eight Vicars Apostolic, the Lord Bishops of Liège, Luxembourg, Tournai and Treves, and a crowd of persons of all ranks. The Venerable Bishop Walsh, a link with the last days of Challoner and the expiring penal laws, was

unfortunately too ill to be present. Bishop Wiseman preached in the morning and Bishop Gillis of Edinburgh in the evening. One notable and expected guest was also conspicuous by his absence, but the Insurrection of the barracades was even at that hour raging in Paris, and Monsignor Affre, its Archbishop, could not leave his distracted flock. Not long afterwards this devoted and heroic chief pastor fell mortally wounded by a musket-ball while endeavouring to mediate between the insurgents and the troops. "May my blood be the last shed" were the pathetic and moving words of the dying prelate, and it was a prayer not said in vain. The universal sorrow caused by the tragic happening seems speedily to have ended the conflict, for the great Archbishop was beloved by all, and moreover the revolution of 1848, unlike those of 1789 and 1830, was singularly and happily free from marked hostility to religion, as most historians agree.

Amidst such circumstances did the much debated Cathedral of St. George begin its beneficent career. Even before the restoration of the Hierarchy, two years later, St. George's was often described as a "Cathedral" as if in anticipation of that event. Not only that, but Bishop Walsh, Vicar Apostolic of the London District, had also been more than once referred to in some general publications as "Archbishop of Westminster", as Cardinal Wiseman later reminded Lord John Russell and the excited British public during the "Papal Aggression" agitation, 1850-51. The Cardinal administered the Diocese of Southwark for a short time until the arrival from the English College, Rome, of the Rt. Rev. Thomas Grant, its first Bishop. It was from the pulpit of St. George's that the Cardinal delivered those lucid and timely lectures on the new Hierarchy which were listened to with close attention by crowds of persons of "all religions and none", and which, with his manly "Appeal to the reason and good feeling of the English people", did so much to allay the storm. Though the subsequent history of the Diocese is no part of this account, it may be remarked here that much of the initial work connected with the restoration of Bishops in ordinary in this country in place of the Vicars Apostolic is directly due to Bishop Grant's zeal and foresight, as Archbishop Ullathorne has gratefully recorded.

As long as it lasted, St. George's, both for style and contents, apart from other considerations, was one of the most interesting structures of its kind in London, if not of England. Its proportions revealed the master hand of an architectural genius, and its interior, though somewhat sombre, owing to the many and rather heavily coloured windows and the resulting "dim religious light", was singularly ornate. The internal length, 240 ft. by 70 ft., comprising a nave, two aisles, a spacious sanctuary, Blessed Sacrament and Lady chapels and some chantries, gave a pleasing symmetrical note of completeness. The high altar, with the carved oak choir stalls and episcopal throne, this latter modelled after the Coronation Chair in Westminster Abbey, enhanced by the arms of the several former Bishops, was further set off by the splendid East window with its "Root of Jesse" design—a gift of that great

Catholic layman, John, sixteenth Earl of Shrewsbury, who died in 1852. A noble rood screen, described as "an original work of the fifteenth century", formerly stood in the usual place, but being found to obstruct the view of the high altar, was removed to the entrance of the Cathedral about 1885. The fine antique crucifix which surmounted it was re-hung over the chancel arch at Easter, 1906. The redecoration of the Blessed Sacrament chapel, conspicuous for its fine East windows and gilded grille, was carried out about the same time. The Lady chapel on the Epistle side was a gem of its kind, with blue and gold as the prevailing colour motive, giving the sacred place the appearance of an illuminated page from some mediaeval Book of Hours. Not far from it is the Petre Chantry, the burial-place of the before-mentioned Hon. Edward Petre, M.P. A little farther down is the Talbot Chantry, chiefly used as a relic chapel. The richly decorated Knill Chantry on the Gospel side was erected by the Knill family, of which the most famous member was the late Sir Stuart Knill, Lord Mayor of London 1892-3. Until the time of its destruction there stood near the entrance of the Cathedral a very imposing crucifix of bronze and wood. This really fine specimen of sacred art is stated to have once belonged to Napoleon, while the style of the figure recalls similar examples by Michelangelo. The crucifix which, it is said, was presented to Canon Doyle by the Emperor of Austria, presumably Ferdinand I (1835-48), has, alas, been seriously injured in the late destruction of the Cathedral, but it may be repairable. Another conspicuous and artistic piece of furniture is the massive eagle lectern. This was one of the exhibits in the Gothic Section of the Great Exhibition of 1851, and though much injured, owing to the cause just mentioned, is capable of renovation. But the splendid stone font, which in 1889 took the place of the venerable one of the old London Road Chapel already recorded, must be reckoned with the many objects of interest and utility destroyed on 17 April last.

Of recent years much was done to add to the number of the few original stained glass windows. The new ones represented such subjects as (1) St. John the Divine; (2) St. Thomas of Canterbury, with incidents in his life and martyrdom; (3) St. Andrew, Apostle. (4) St. Alphonsus Liguori—a memorial to Bishop Coffin, C.S.S.R., third Bishop of Southwark (1882-85); (5) St. George, Patron of England and of the Diocese; (6) St. Augustine of England. This last window was of special interest, being a memorial of the Celebration at Ebbsfleet, Thanet, 1897, of the thirteen hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Apostle of this nation. The several "lights" represented (a) The preaching of the first Archbishop of Canterbury before Ethelbert and Queen Bertha; (b) The foundation of Douay College by Cardinal Allen (1568); (c) The generous hospitality of the people of this country to the French *émigrés*, ecclesiastical and lay, at the time of the great Revolution.

In the spacious "Bishop's House" adjoining the Cathedral, which replaced the old clergy residence of 1848, thanks to the munificence of the

late Willock Dawes, Esq., a great benefactor to the Diocese, are preserved a number of valuable ecclesiastical antiquities and interesting examples of mediaeval craftsmanship chiefly collected by the late Canon Daniel Rock, the historian (died 1871). It is most gratifying to be able to state that the church plate in the Cathedral Sacristy itself did not fall a prey to the flames with so much else, but is happily preserved, mainly through the courageous exertions of the Rev. M. Byron, C. Cowderoy, H. Donaghey, and others of the staff, not forgetting the excellent sacristan, Mr. W. Howard. Among these treasures are (*a*) a gold chalice presented by Pius IX, (1848); (*b*) a silver gilt chalice, believed to have belonged to St. Thomas More; (*c*) a small silver chalice, formerly the property of Bishop Walsh, V.A.L.; (*d*) a magnificent gold monstrance studded with jewels; (*e*) an antique silver chalice and paten, history unknown.

Want of space has necessarily prevented the inclusion of many matters relating to St. George's that are of great interest, though in this brief and imperfect account perhaps enough has been stated to show what is the magnitude of the loss. But the fortitude of the nation, which has been so signally displayed in the recurring deadly perils of the present war, gives every ground for believing that the courage of our own people will be no less in facing the heavy task of repairing the sudden and tragic loss of our cherished Cathedral. Our revered Archbishop-Bishop, who has laboured so long, so steadfastly and so fruitfully in our midst, has the right to expect this, and we of the present must be at least as generous as were those of past generation who gave us our Mother Church—the Church which, during a century almost, has done so much in Southwark and far beyond it, to consolidate and extend that Faith which is the mainspring of the Victor that overcometh the World.

BERNARD KELLY, F.R.Hist.Soc.

THE TEACHING OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

"You don't know how to manage Looking-glass cakes," the Unicorn remarked.
"Hand it round first, and cut it afterwards."

(*Through the Looking-glass.*)

IT is a strange fact that seminary students often find their Dogmatic Theology the least interesting and most difficult part of their work. Unless their attention is caught by an attractive exposition of the history of Dogma, or by the speculations of some professor of exceptional ability, many of them resign themselves to the unintelligent and laborious course of learning their theses by heart, forgetting them soon and never understanding them. For while the evident need of Moral Theology for their professional work, and the natural interest of philosophy, exegesis and history comfort and stimulate them in many of their studies, among the high and apparently remote mysteries of Dogma interest fails, and conscientious devotion does not carry them far. Even men of ability, who have successfully overcome greater difficulties in other and less interesting work before they began their seminary course, often succumb to this torpor, and approach the subject with a dullness and incompetence of which they would be quite incapable in any other matter.

It is sometimes suggested that the subject itself is to blame, and that it is in fact so difficult that only a few men can be expected to reach any real understanding of it; but in truth it does not need so great an effort of the mind as philosophy, and the obvious appeal of its history, and its utility for prayer and preaching should encourage anyone to make the necessary effort. Nor can lack of ability in the students be the cause of the trouble, for it is not only the dull ones that fail.

But perhaps this dullness, so often found and apparently fostered to some extent by the seclusion of life in a seminary or religious house, is not altogether without blame; for it tempts the teacher to stick to certain traditional methods, and these methods seem to lie at the bottom of the problem. If he is to get to the end of his course in time the professor dare not experiment in his lectures; and if he tries he does not always meet with an encouraging response in the class. For this reason and for others the teaching of Dogma has long run in deep and well-worn grooves, unaffected by changes of method in other subjects or by the changing outlook and education of the students for whom it is intended. It may therefore be of interest to compare our present method and order of presentation with those used by successful teachers of similar subjects in the past, and discover whether the obvious differences between them have not something to do with present difficulties.

Three examples will serve to illustrate the most striking contrasts. First let us see how Plato (or Socrates) does it, choosing as a specimen of his technique the plan of the Republic. After the scene has been set the discussion begins with a question from Socrates (the teacher) on the nature of justice; it is answered first in one way and then in another by his friends,

who alter their definitions as the discussion proceeds and do not give up their case until it has proved quite hopeless. Only after the ground has been cleared in this way does Socrates take the lead, and develop by question far more than by statement his own account of the virtue ; he refuses at first to consider it directly as it exists in the soul of the individual, preferring to describe first the just state and to advance from it by analogy to the characteristics of the just man. Plato, then, thought he could best convince his readers of his doctrine by a conversational exposition, in which the teacher leads the discussion by judicious questions, analogies and illustrations from error into truth.

It is quite otherwise with Aristotle who, however he may have conducted his classes, has left no dialogues behind him ; but he too shews something of the same kind of approach in the summaries of his teaching that survive. At the beginning of the Nicomachean Ethics, for instance, after a few prefatory remarks "about the student, the sort of treatment to be expected and the purpose of the inquiry" he proceeds to a discussion of "the good"; people agree, he says, that it is happiness, but differ about the meaning of the word : some use it to mean pleasure, others honour or wealth. Only after a discussion of these common opinions and a criticism of Plato's Idea of the Good does Aristotle draw a definition of man's good from his function ; "Let this," he says, "serve as an outline of the good ; for we must presumably first sketch it roughly, and then later fill in the details." Aristotle too, it seems, proceeds like Plato from common opinions and vulgar errors to a systematic account of the subject ; his conclusion comes at the end of his book, not at the beginning.

Lastly, let us consider the method of St. Thomas himself : the question is (for instance) whether there is passion in the soul ; it seems there is none, for suffering is proper to matter ; moreover passion is motion, and the soul is not moved ; and further, passion is the way to corruption, but the soul is incorruptible. However, St. Paul seems to speak as though there were passions in the soul. After these preliminary pros and cons he gives his own opinion and makes the distinctions necessary for an answer to the objections. In short his method is to propose the subject for discussion as an open question, not as a thesis ; to state some arguments on this side and on that, weighting the scales heavily against what will be his conclusion ; and finally to give his own solution of the problem, and to answer the difficulties in detail.

Perhaps the use we now make of these expositions of St. Thomas gives the answer to our inquiry ; for it is now the custom in commenting on his Articles to deal first with the *Corpus* after only a glance at the *Sed Contra* ; when his solution is understood each objection and its answer is considered in turn. So we adhere to the familiar order of the modern text-book. In other words while we preserve as far as we can every jot and tittle of his doctrine, we deliberately reject his manner of exposition in favour of our own : and this preposterous *layout* of the subject is, it seems, the first cause

give up
and has
question
fuses a
al, pre-
logy to
ld best
n which
es and
ducted
nething
survive
ew pre-
ed and
good";
ning of
Only
's Idea
om his
we must
ristotle
r errors
end of
question
here is
on, and
on, but
h there
e gives
to the
cussion
his side
is con-
answer
s gives
on his
Contra
considered
book. In
e of his
of our
t cause

of our failure in teaching it. For consider the method of our manuals : they open the matter with an elaborately expressed thesis, which outlines with innumerable qualifying clauses the whole conclusion of the discussion. Only when the mind of the disciple is sated with this mass of carefully articulated truth is he allowed to see the reasons on which it rests ; he never sees the thing as a problem urgently demanding an answer, and can never look at the texts adduced from Scripture and the Fathers with a fresh mind, but knowing the answer beforehand he is willing and able to find some prop for his thesis in even the most remote and mystical passages that the piety of theologians has been able to find for its support. He begins not with a problem, but with an answer, not with the loosely expressed testimonies of early writers, but with the elaborate conclusion of the theologians ; and so his interest is never kindled, and he remembers nothing unless he learns the book by heart ; a course that is sometimes even recommended by his professor. How much more admirable is the procedure of writers of detective stories, who though they must know the answer to their mystery before they begin to write, nevertheless refuse to let the cat out of the bag before the end of the book.

The same order of exposition is one of the principles most frequently insisted on by modern experts on the technique of teaching in all subjects. The point may be made clear by two or three quotations. "Never press forward formal abstract considerations until experience has paved the way."¹ "Go on the principle of the parallel grammars—examples first, then rules deduced from the examples, the deductions to be made as far as possible by the boys themselves in the course of question and answer."² "'Examples before rule' may be taken as the first great principle in the early teaching of Latin . . . the three stages in the acquirement of knowledge are equally emphasized, (1) the need of a general law, arising from the collection of many facts ; (2) the formulation of that law ; (3) the use of the law when discovered and formulated."³

The parallel principle in the teaching of theology is easy to formulate : first should come the texts from Scripture and the Fathers, and possibly a few popular views of the doctrine in question ; the antinomies presented in them put the matter as a problem, to be answered by the formulation of a thesis, thought out as far as possible by the students themselves ; this conclusion should then be used for the solution of problems and the interpretation of texts which have not already been discussed.

To sum up in the jargon of educational psychology, theology like all other subjects should be taught not didactically but heuristically. Let us end the argument with one more quotation : "Some years ago I made a comparative study of the heuristic and didactic methods of teaching elementary school mathematics. The results showed that those who had

¹ Westaway : *Craftsmanship in the Teaching of Elementary Mathematics*, 1931, p. 11.

² Lewis : *Practical Hints on the Teaching of Latin*, 1919, p. 63.

³ Jones : *The Teaching of Latin*, Blackie, n.d., p. 38.

been taught by the heuristic method were not only better able to apply their knowledge to unusual problems, but were also much more eager to do so. . . . Those who had been taught by the heuristic method admitted two interests, one in the subject itself, and the other in the method by which the subject had been taught. One of the boys, better psychologist than he knew, wrote: 'The new method cleans and expands the mind. It gives us the desire to think'.¹ These quotations are taken from writers on elementary education only because the technique of elementary teaching has received more attention than the technique of teaching theology; in spite of difference of age and of subject, in spite even of the necessarily "dogmatic" and authoritarian attitude of a theology professor to his unique subject, their conclusions apply equally well to seminary problems; for even in elementary Latin or mathematics only one answer is right in each case, and the speculations of the children have a predetermined end.

So far so good, for we believe it difficult to dispute the commonly admitted conclusion which we have urged above. The suggestions that follow are offered in a far more tentative spirit, and beg the favour of a separate hearing without prejudice to their predecessors. For the question how this Socratic or heuristic method can be used in seminary circumstances still remains to be answered: are the manuals to be rewritten backwards so that the argument stalks its conclusion over a long and circuitous spoor of half-hidden hints, sudden surprises and uncertain direction? It seems not; for the present order of presentation has enormous advantages for apologetic purposes, for private study and for rapid reference; and the "Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae ad mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis hodier-nis moribus methodoque heuristicae accommodata" would be a very bulky piece of work if ever it were written. Let us, then, retain the familiar textbooks, and try to discover some way of using them which will have all the advantages of the manner of teaching suggested.

It seems clear, in the first place, that as a means to teaching of this sort the lecture is not the best manner of exposition; for a lecturer is ignorant of his hearers' thoughts, he cannot feel his way or know how far he is succeeding until the time comes for an examination. There is no opportunity for the student to clear up his private difficulties, and in a course of lectures the right moment for giving the needed help may easily pass before he has a chance of putting a question, often a difficult matter in a seminary; or he may himself neglect the trouble until it is no longer clear in his mind, and so forget it altogether.²

¹ Spens and others: *Report . . . on Secondary Education*, H.M.S.O. 1939; Appendix V, p. 449.

² One more quotation: "The teacher's subject . . . is not books, but mind. On the other hand the lecturer's subject in the first instance is not mind, but books. This distinction is vital, and the most important results follow. Broad is the dyke, and deep, that cuts across between the teacher and the lecturer, dividing them by a bridgeless space . . . to the ordinary eye they are engaged in the same work, with the same surroundings, and the same object. But they are divided for ever in theory, and in practice." (Thring: *Theory and Practice of Teaching*. Cambridge, 1883, p. 147.)

A class too, where some discussion is admitted, has its disadvantages, for the solution of one man's difficulty keeps his fellows idle and uninterested unless they share it. Only constant individual attention can do all that is needed.

It seems that a system of lectures and private interviews (sometimes called "tutorials") would work best in a seminary, just as it does with students of the same age at universities. In his lectures the professor would no longer be limited to an exposition of the manual, still less to the translation of it into English or the dictation of notes; he could approach the subject in a far more general way, not as a thesis to be defended but as a problem to be solved. For instance he could begin to speak of the virtue of Faith by pointing out the apparent inconsistency of the two accepted statements that knowledge by Faith gives certainty, and that the act of Faith is meritorious; he could shew other antinomies in the ordinary views of the subject, attempt an answer by an exegesis of St. Paul's description of the virtue, and so develop the subject that he arrived at last at a real definition, the solution of all the problems proposed. Such lectures need not be as frequent as theological lectures usually are in seminaries, for the professor need do no more than open up the subject and set it out as a problem, leaving the systematic study of it to the students' own reading of the manuals, of the French *Dictionnaire de Théologie*, and of such authors as Joyce and D'Arcy, Marin-Sola, de la Taille and Garrigou-Lagrange; we should thus avoid the common fault of teachers, the habit of doing all the work ourselves and leaving none to the students, of preaching instead of teaching, of fulminating definitions instead of making them think.

But something is needed to control the private work of the class, and nothing can do this better than a weekly essay, read privately to the professor or another member of the staff, and discussed at length. No mere summary of the apologetic information of the manual would serve for this; a balanced statement of the problem, and a reasoned answer, should be demanded. And that in English; for nothing is harder than to translate theological jargon into language suitable for a sermon, and for this the ordinary system does little to prepare us.

The great objection to all this is, of course, the question of time; it will be said that even if he lectures less frequently it will be impossible for a professor to see each of his pupils for an hour once a week, if his life is to remain tolerable and his work well prepared. But many, and we think decisive, considerations tell the other way. In the first place if the number of students is very large they could be taken in "seminars" of carefully chosen twos and threes; they would thus lose few of the advantages we seek. Secondly such interviews need not all fall to the professor himself; they demand far less learning than tact, less divinity than humanity, and he may well find among his colleagues men as able as himself to do the job under his supervision and much less busy. Thirdly the thing needs no preparation; it is not even necessary to see the essay beforehand, if the subject is familiar

and the pupil no genius ; moreover if the author knows that he will have to read it aloud he will give far more attention to its preparation. And lastly the system would provide at once what we have so long desired, an opportunity for real friendship between staff and students ; and that of a kind that can never arise between a lecturer and his audience, a ruler and his subjects, even through the sharing of common sports and recreations.

In the first part of this paper we have pointed out what is, we believe, a serious mistake of technique in the ordinary practice of teachers of theology, and suggested the obvious remedy ; in the second we have outlined a system by which, in spite of obvious difficulties, the suggestion could be put into practice. Aware that this second part is less likely to meet with assent, we add it with great hesitation, fearing to obscure any truth there may be in what precedes.

Other solutions of the problem have sometimes been proposed, especially through a historical approach to the subject ; but it seems clear after experiment that this needs more time than can generally be allowed if the ground is to be covered, and that the history of Dogma is too large and too difficult a subject to serve as a vehicle for the necessary minimum of dogmatic and apologetic knowledge. We have to confess that we have never attempted what we suggest, nor ever heard of such an experiment, though it must often have occurred to both students and professors ; but we believe that the scheme is in accordance with the Christian tradition of catechetical instruction, and that this double approach through the didactic manual and the heuristic lecture and essay would go far to create a real ability for theological thinking and exposition.

PAEDAGOGUS.

JOHN DRYDEN. CATHOLIC APOLOGIST

“GLORIOUS JOHN DRYDEN”, although highly esteemed by earlier critics and ever a favourite with fellow poets, has never fully recovered from the cocksure and ill-natured judgements of Macaulay. Much subsequent criticism has been coloured to some extent by the strong impression that the brilliant writing of Macaulay always manages to leave behind him. Even now when the character of Dryden has been cleared of the grosser charges of time-serving and personal immorality which Macaulay brought against him,¹ there remains among many a reluctance to give him his full share of praise as one of the greatest and most versatile writers in English. His many-sidedness makes it easy to suggest that he is a literary jack-of-all trades, his intellectual power is regarded suspiciously as if it disqualified him from ranking as a poet at all, his tampering with Shakespeare has precluded him from receiving adequate appreciation as a dramatist, and the basest personalities of Pope’s feline animosity have been fathered on him, because of his “Macflecknoe”, although that satire, brilliant as it is, is not characteristic of Dryden at all. One sometimes is tempted to wonder whether Dryden has really never been forgiven for the “Hind and the Panther”, and whether the kinder treatment accorded to Pope does not owe something to the lukewarmness of his Catholicity. Whatever the reason, now that there is a marked revival of interest in Pope perhaps there is hope of Dryden receiving more generous consideration. He has never been without his doughty champions, although they have been in a minority for a long time now. Pope himself always spoke warmly in his master’s praise, and, it is said, treasured a shilling that the older poet had given him for a boyish rendering of a passage from Ovid. No one certainly has expressed more happily than Pope the sweep and natural force of Dryden’s verse :

Waller was smooth ; but Dryden taught to join
The varying verse, the full-resounding line,
The long majestic march and energy divine.²

The pupil outstripped the master in some respects no doubt, and there is justification for Thackeray’s verdict that Pope is “the greatest literary artist that England has seen”, but it is indisputably true that Dryden had a much wider range than Pope and that his work was of stronger intellectual fibre. If there was less art in Dryden there was more matter. Pope’s prose is negligible. Dryden’s urbane and easy prose in his *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* and in the Preface to the *Fables* greatly enhances his critical estimates of writers like Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Ben Jonson, estimates which have been the basis of much subsequent comment. To give only one example, Pope’s essay on Shakespeare is little more than an expansion of Dryden’s criticism in the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*.

¹ Cf. *Dryden (English Men of Letters)*, Saintsbury ; *Dryden*, by Christopher Hollis.

² Pope’s Fifth Satire, ll 267-9.

Pope's poetry was confined to didactic and satirical themes in a way that Dryden's was not. He never attempted drama. Dryden not only wrote one admirable play, but he did a great deal to raise the general level of play-writing in his day. Although Dryden was deficient in the pictorial and lyrical qualities that make "The Rape of the Lock" a perennial delight, his superb technique can almost convince us that he had them in good measure as may be seen by studying his rendering of Chaucer's Knight's Tale, or the best of his songs. Mr. Bonamy Dobré¹ has recently pointed out that although Dryden was not strong in visual imagery he excelled in aural imagery. As to satire, it is still permissible to hold with Johnson that Absalom and Achitophel is the greatest satire in the language.

Where, however, Dryden surpasses Pope and indeed all other English poets is in his power of exposition, of reasoning beautifully and vividly in verse. Assuredly he would never have needed like Pope a Warburton to tell the world what precisely he meant by anything he wrote. Yet on Johnson's testimony Pope was glad to be rescued from the talons of Crousaz, after the publication of his *Essay on Man*, by this Protestant Bishop. Johnson cites a letter he wrote to Warburton in which he says "I know I meant just what you explain ; but I did not explain my own meaning so well as you. You understand me as well as I do myself ; but you express me better than I could myself".²

Dryden's dialectic naturally finds its fullest scope in "Religio Laici" and the "Hind and the Panther", and perhaps we should have heard even more about the former if it had not been followed by the latter. As it is, we invariably hear how much better it is than the "Hind and the Panther", just as we hear how much better Newman's Plain and Parochial Sermons are than his Catholic sermons. Far be it from me to deny the austere beauty of the Parochial and Plain Sermons, but are they not the sermons of an earnest soul none too happy in his religion ? Whereas in the Catholic sermons does not Newman suggest himself that the winter of his discontent is over, and that he is basking in the genial warmth of the sun ? Is it altogether surprising that he grows wings ? One may make a similar comparison between the "Religio Laici" and the "Hind and the Panther", and one can find too a similar tenderness towards the Established Church, in which both Dryden and Newman had been cradled and reared. Nor does the parallel end there. Both Newman and Dryden were temperamentally inclined to Scepticism. That may be put too strongly, but at least both appreciated with imaginative insight the sceptic's difficulties. Dryden writes in the Preface to "Religio Laici" "Being naturally inclined to Scepticism in Philosophy, I have no reason to impose my opinions, in a subject which is above it". Huxley³ claimed that he could compile a primer of infidelity from Newman's works. Both Dryden and Newman regarded the Anglican Church as a bulwark against Deism. The "Religio Laici" and "Via Media" have that in common, and

¹ See *Fifteen Poets, From Chaucer to Arnold*, p. 142.

² Cf. Ward's *Life of Newman*, vol. i, p. 16.

³ Cf. Johnson's *Life of Pope*.

ay that
wrote
evel of
ial and
ht, his
measure
or the
ut that
n aural
on that

English
idly in
erton to
John-
rousaz,
Bishop.
know I
so well
ess me

ci" and
n more
invari-
t as we
han his
of the
earnest
ermons
is over,
together
son be-
ran find
Dryden
d there,
ticism.
nigative
Religio
o reason
ned that
Both
against
on, and

of Pope.

there is no reason to suppose that they changed their opinions after they became Catholics. There is little positive teaching in "Religio Laici". It is in the main a plea for some sort of Christian creed against the Deists, but there is a note of uncertainty and hesitation running all through it, and a reiteration that the ordinary Christian should be content with knowing some simple truths of faith and living up to them ;

What then remains, but, waving each extreme,
The Tides of Ignorance, and Pride to stem ?
Neither so rich a Treasure to forgo ;
Nor proudly seek beyond our power to know :
Faith is not built on disquisitions vain ;
The things we *must* believe are *few and plain*.

Dryden seems here desperately anxious to show how little one need believe to be counted a Christian. What other conclusion is one to draw from his vague finale ?

"Tis some relief, that points not clearly known,
Without much hazard may be left alone :
And after hearing what our Church can say,
If still our reason runs another way,
That private reason 'tis more just to curb,
Than by Disputes the publick Peace disturb.
For points obscure are of small use to learn :
But Common quiet is Mankind's concern.

Newman later hoped to base his "Via Media" on the writings of those same Anglican divines of the seventeenth century, which Dryden tells us he used for "Religio Laici". In the Preface to that work, Dryden had written, "In the next place I will ingenuously confess, that the helps I have used in this small treatise, were many of them taken from the works of our own Reverend Divines of the Church of England." Like Newman, for whom "the theory of the 'Via Media' was absolutely pulverised"¹ by the *securus judicat orbis terrarum* of St. Augustine, Dryden was soon to find them inadequate.

While there is no asperity against Anglicanism as such in the "Hind and the Panther", there is a feeling of joy and confidence as of one who possesses the truth and pities those still floundering about in the mists of doubt and indecision. Its motto might easily be "Ex umbra et imaginibus in veritatem".

The allegorical form of the "Hind and the Panther" has admittedly grave disadvantages and repels modern readers, but Dryden manages it well, and not without his usual skill in character drawing. The sharpest etching is of the Buzzard, the Whig Bishop, Gilbert Burnet. One may regret the mingling of politics with religion here and elsewhere, but one can hardly blame Dryden for seeing that the Whig dogs did not get the better of the argument, like Johnson later in a different context. The scathing picture of Burnet anticipates Pope's similar attack on Hervey as Sporus in the

¹ *Apologia*, p. 121.

Epistle to Arbuthnot, although Dryden is more detached and consequently more effective. The reiterated sibilants and the criss-cross alliteration give added edge to the satire.

God save King Buzzard, was the gen'rall cry,
A Portly Prince, and goodly to the sight,
He seemed a Son of Anach for his height ;
Like those whom stature did to Crowns prefer ;
Black-browed and bluff, like Homer's Jupiter ;
Broad-backed and Brawny built for Love's delight,
A prophet formed to make a female Proselyte,
A Theologue more by need, than genial bent
By breeding sharp, by Nature confident.

To admirers of Absalom and Achitophel this deft portraiture is not anything new : he had done even better in the earlier poem. We are more anxious to illustrate how admirably Dryden can clothe Catholic doctrine in language exact and beautiful. He divides the poem into three parts. In the first part he refers to the need not only for faith but for an infallible guide. In the second he gives the discussion between the "Hind and the Panther", and in the third he reviews their respective fortunes from the time of Henry's schism up to the time of James II. Intermixed with the references to Anglicanism and Catholicism there is much satire on the Dissenters and also many political sallies, which do not concern us here. After a reference to the many attempts made on the life of "the milk white Hind", which was "doomed to death, though fated not to dy", Dryden goes on to point out the ineffectiveness of private judgement, and in his plea for an infallible church makes an eloquent avowal of his own previous wanderings in search of truth—that truth which "has such a face and such a meen as to be loved needs only to be seen". He continues :

What weight of ancient witness can prevail
If private reason hold the public scale ?
But, gracious God, how well dost thou provide
For erring judgments an unerring guide !
Thy throne is darkness in th' abyss of light
A blaze of glory that forbids the sight ;
O teach me to believe Thee thus concealed,
And search no farther than Thy self reveal'd :
But her alone for my Director take
Whom Thou hast promised never to forsake !
My thoughtless youth was winged with vain desires,
My manhood, long misled by wandering fires,
Followed false lights : and when their glimps was gone,
My pride struck out new sparkles of her own.
Such was I, such by nature still I am,
Be Thine the glory and be mine the shame.
Good life be now my task : my doubts are done,
(What more could fright my faith, than Three in One ?)
Can I believe eternal God could lye
Disguis'd in mortal mold and infancy ?
That the great Maker of the world could dye ?
And after that trust my imperfect sense
Which calls in question his omnipotence ?

Can I my reason to my faith compell,
 And shall my sight, and touch, and taste rebell ?
 Superior faculties are set aside,
 Shall their subservient organs be my guide ?
 Then let the moon usurp the rule of day,
 And winking tapers shew the sun his way ;
 For what my senses can themselves perceive
 I need no revelation to believe.

This might well be taken as a good example of the poetry of wit, which Dryden himself has described as "that which is well defined, the happy result of Thought, or product of Imagination".¹ He later enlarges on what he means by imagination—"so then the first happiness of the Poet's Imagination is properly invention, or finding of the thought ; the second is fancy, or the variation, deriving or moulding of that thought as the Judgement represents it proper to the subject ; the third is Elocution, or the Art of clothing and adorning that thought so found and varied, in apt, significant, and sounding words : the quickness of the Imagination is seen in the Invention, the fertility in the Fancy, and the accuracy in the Expression". It will be noted that Dryden's poetic effects are quite deliberately aimed at, and that consequently one ought to judge him according to how far he achieved them, and not look in his poetry for qualities he never intended should be there. Like Chaucer, whom he admired so much, he had a great deal of literary tact and knew perfectly well what he was about, and what were the limits of his genius. He never essays what is quite outside the range of his capability ; indeed, he usually seems to have an easy mastery of his subject matter, however un-malleable for poetic purposes it may appear. He does this too in the simplest fashion, and with a minimum disarrangement of the natural order of words. Consider for example this passage on the teaching Church :

Before the Word was written, said the Hind,
 Our Saviour preached his Faith to humane kind :
 From his Apostles the first age receiv'd
 Eternal truth, and what they taught, believ'd,
 Thus by tradition faith was planted first ;
 Succeeding flocks succeeding Pastours nurs'd.
 This was the way our wise Redeemer chose,
 (Who sure could all things for the best dispose,)
 To fence his fold from their encroaching foes.
 He could have writ himself, but well foresaw
 Th' event would be like that of Moyses law ;
 Some difference wou'd arise, some doubts remain,
 Like those which yet the jarring Jews maintain.
 No written laws can be so plain so pure,
 But wit may gloss and malice may obscure ;
 Not those indited by his first command,
 A Prophet grav'd the text, an Angel held his hand.
 Thus faith was e'er the written word appeared,
 And men believ'd not what they read but heard.

The last line is an instance of what is common in Dryden, the skilful weaving of scriptural phrases into his vigorous couplets. There are surely echoes

¹ Cf. Preface to "Annus Mirabilis".

too of St. Thomas in his references to the Holy Eucharist, yet how neatly he popularizes the scholastic idiom. He is refuting Protestant ideas about the Real Presence.

A real presence all her sons allow,
And yet 'tis flat idolatry to bow,
Because the God-heads there they know not how.
Her Novices are taught that bread and wine
Are but the visible and outward sign,
Received by those who in communion joyn;
But th' inward grace or the thing signified,
His blood and body who to save us died,
The faithful thin thing signify'd receive.
What is't those faithful then partake or leave ?
For what is signify'd and understood,
Is by her own confession, flesh and blood.
Then by the same acknowledgment, we know
They take the sign and take the substance too,
The lit'r al sense is hard to flesh and blood,
But nonsense never can be understood.

The Panther opens the debate in the second part by saying that the Hind has no longer to endure open persecution, but cannot refrain from suggesting that in those evil days while individual priests gave their lives for the Faith :

their careful mother, wisely fled,
Not trusting destiny to save your head.
For, whate'er promises you have applied
To your unfailing Church, the surer side
Is four fair legs in danger to provide.
And whate'er tales of Peter's chair you tell,
Yet, saving reverence of the miracle,
The better luck was yours to 'scape so well.

The Hind finds little difficulty in retorting to this, that the Panther had only escaped a similar fate, by remaining dumb on the main question :

Dumb you were born indeed ; but thinking long,
The Test it seems, at last has loosed your tongue.
And to explain what your forefathers meant
By real presence in the sacrament,
After long fencing pushed against a wall,
Your salvo comes, that He's not there at all :
There changed your faith, and what may change may fall.
Who can believe what varies every day,
Nor ever was, nor will be at a stay ?

A trifle disconcerted, the Panther pleads that :

Tortures may force the tongue untruths to tell
And I ne'er owned myself infallible,

to which the Hind swiftly answers :

I freely grant you spoke to save your life ;
 For then you lay beneath the butcher's knife.
 Long time you fought, redoubled battery bore,
 But after all, against yourself you swore ;
 Your former self, for ev'ry Hour your form
 Is Chop'd and chang'd, like Winds before a Storm.
 Thus Fear and Int'rest will prevail with some,
 For all have not the Gift of Martyrdom.

The Panther grinned at this home-thrust, but still asserted man's fallibility as an excuse, and demanded to see "that wondrous Wight, infallibility". Where did he reside ?

Is he from Heav'n this mighty Champion come
 Or lodg'd below in subterranean Rome ?

When one considers that the Pope's infallibility was then not a defined article of faith, what could be more cogent or clearer than the Hind's answer ? One would like to quote it in full, but since that is impossible perhaps a generous extract will reveal its quality :

I then affirm that this unfailing guide
 In Pope and gen'ral Councils must reside ;
 Both lawful, both combin'd ; what one decrees
 By numerous Votes, the other ratifies :
 On this undoubted Sense the Church relies.
 'Tis true some Doctors in a scantier space,
 I mean in each apart contract the Place.
 Some, who to greater length extend the line,
 The Churches after acceptance join.
 This last Circumference appears too wide,
 The Church diffus'd is by the Council ty'd ;
 As members by their Representatives
 Oblig'd to Laws which Prince and Senate gives :
 Thus some contract, and some enlarge the space ;
 In Pope and Council who denies the place,
 Assisted from above with God's unfailing grace ?
 Those Canons all the needful points contain ;
 Their sense so obvious, and their words so plain,
 That no disputes about the doubtful Text
 Have hitherto, the Lab'ring world perplex'd :
 If any should in after times appear,
 New Councils must be called, to make the meaning clear.
 Because in them the pow'r supreme resides ;
 And all the promises are to the Guides.

No less brilliantly does Dryden, through the mouth of the Hind, go on to show the necessity of a living, teaching authority in answer to the Panther's cry of the Bible, and the Bible only, and similarly to expose the fallacy of accepting only the Early Councils as authoritative interpreters of the Church's teaching. He likewise sets out the four marks of the Church in language that is ringing and dignified. Witness these resounding lines on the unity and sanctity of the Bride of Christ :

THE CLERGY REVIEW

Behold what heavenly rays adorn her brows,
 What from his wardrobe her belov'd allows
 To deck the wedding day of his unspotted spouse.
 Behold what marks of Majesty she brings ;
 Richer than antient heirs of Eastern kings :
 Her right hand holds the sceptre and the keys,
 To show whom she commands, and who obeys :
 With these to bind or set the sinner free,
 With that t'assert spiritual Royalty.
 One in herself, not rent by schism, but sound,
 Entire, one solid shining Diamond,
 Not Sparkles shattered into Sects like you,
 One is the Church, and must be to be true
 One central principle of unity.
 As one in faith, so one in sanctity.

In the Preface to the "Hind and the Panther" Dryden declared that the nation at that period was "in too High a Ferment" for him "to expect either fair War or even so much as fair Quarter from a Reader of the opposite party". It has been the object of this paper to try and indicate that Dryden's fears may still have some justification, and to contend that Catholics at least should not swallow too readily what non-Catholic critics have to say about either his merits as a whole, or about the Hind and the Panther in particular.

JOSEPH W. DUNNE.

ANOTHER NOTE ON MATTHEW XIX, 3-12

IN the April number of the CLERGY REVIEW, Fathers Dyson and Leeming, S.J., seek to solve the problem of Matthew xix, 3-12, by giving the word *porneia* the meaning of "incest". They make our Lord say in effect : "Whoever putteth away his wife—unless indeed his marriage to her was incestuous—and marrieth another woman, he committeth adultery". They find support for their suggestion in the fact that the word in question apparently has this sense in the acts of the Council of Jerusalem, Acts xv, 29, and in St. Paul's reference to the incestuous Corinthian, I Cor. v, 1. They also suggest that Herod's marriage with Herodias, his brother's wife, which had led to the murder of St. John the Baptist, must have made the question of incestuous marriages a living one in our Lord's time and therefore calling for some mention in our Lord's statement of the marriage law. They undoubtedly make out an excellent case for their solution but perhaps they do not fully appreciate the considerations that can be urged against it.

In the chapters of the Book of Leviticus where the Mosaic laws against incest are given, the Hebrew word for incest, *zimmah*, is rendered by *asebema* or *anomia* in the Septuagint and not by *porneia*, nor is it anywhere in the Greek Old Testament thus rendered as far as I know. The word has, indeed, a wide meaning, but its normal connotation in Greek is rather that of commercialized vice, prostitution. It is quite possible, indeed, probable, that in the acts of the Council the reference is to a transgression of the Mosaic marriage laws, but this would scarcely suffice to make *porneia* a technical term for incest.

In Matthew v, 32, Christ's command concerning marriage seems parallel to the other instances in which He deliberately contrasts His new teaching with that given "to the ancients". That in Matthew xix Christ should have inserted during this solemn re-establishment of marriage in its original perfection a short clause still maintaining the Mosaic law of Leviticus seems unlikely. Moreover, some of the provisions of Leviticus go beyond the natural law. By natural law it can scarcely be proved that a marriage between uncle and niece, or between nephew and deceased uncle's wife is invalid. The Council of Jerusalem might have prohibited such marriages by Church law, because Moses was still read in every synagogue, but is it likely that Christ should have included them in divine positive law at this solemn moment? There is surely formal and direct opposition between the law of Moses and of Jesus in the sense that the latter corrects the former : "It has been said . . . but I say to you" with every possible stress on the personal pronoun. It would be strange if in this solemn contrast a concession were made to a section of the Mosaic law in Leviticus, which is not quite identical with the natural law. Again, if our Lord here really meant some concession to Mosaic law, how is it that St. Mark and St. Luke dared to omit it? It might be answered that there is no real concession to Mosaic law, but only a statement of natural law so far as it is embodied in the law of

Moses. But does not this answer make the whole so-called exceptive clause otiose and even unmeaning? "If a man putteth away his wife—except of course when she is not his wife—he committeth adultery, and he who marries a woman thus put away, committeth adultery." Incestuous unions are no marriages at all, and a man not only can but must send the woman away, and since she is unmarried another may marry her.

Since such serious difficulties can be raised against the solution proposed in the April number of this REVIEW may we very tentatively suggest another which seems at least open to fewer objections? Fathers Dyson and Leeming limit themselves to the consideration of the more usual text of Matthew xix, 9, which they assume to be correct and on the correctness of which they base their study. By referring to a "more usual" text they imply the existence of another, and to this other text I would like to direct the reader's attention. The usual text in Matthew xix is *μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ*, literally: "not for *porneia*"; the brevity of this text is somewhat surprising and its rendering "except it be for fornication" though possible, is not certainly correct. This awkward brevity was removed by some scribe who inserted—or perhaps found—the reading *εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ π.*, "if not for fornication". In addition to this less supported reading there is a third, which uses in Matthew xix the same words as are used in Matthew v, 32. The words are *παρεκτός τοι λόγου πορνείας*.

Even if our Lord gave this teaching on divorce on two separate occasions, once during the Sermon on the Mount and once later on when tempted by the Pharisees, it is surely legitimate to use the words used on the former occasion to interpret those used on the latter. It is moreover frequently admitted that the Evangelist in the Sermon on the Mount may have included items of doctrine which were actually delivered at some other time of our Lord's public life. If that be so, the two texts Matthew xix and Matthew v would actually represent identically the same utterance of our Lord, and it would then be imperative to use the one text in elucidation of the other. We suggest therefore that the solution of the problem regarding our Lord's meaning be sought rather in the text Matthew v than in Matthew xix, and not in a special rendering of the word *porneia*, but in a different understanding of the word *perektoς*.

Let us begin with a homely paraphrase of the text which we think you express the meaning our Lord intended to convey. "Whosoever putteth away his wife—I say 'whosoever' without any exception; never mind that Hebrew word *ERVATH* in Deuteronomy xxiv, 1, about the meaning of which you are wrangling amongst yourselves and which you are using to trick me—whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another committeth adultery."

The word *porneia* was chosen by the translator of the original Aramaic text of St. Matthew as a general term to render the notorious Hebrew word in Deuteronomy xxv, 1 : *ERVATH*, about which there was in our Lord's day a keen dispute between the disciples of the rabbis Hillel and Shammai. We

cannot take it for granted that the Greek translator of the inspired Aramaic text was acquainted with this discussion in rabbinical schools. He may have been puzzled by Christ's reference to the word in Deuteronomy xxv, 1, although it was clear enough to Christ's schooled opponents in Jerusalem. The text in Deuteronomy reads : "If a man take a wife and live with her and she find no favour in his eyes because he finds in her **ERVATH DABAR**, he shall write a bill of divorce, etc."

What is the meaning of **ERVATH DABAR**? Literally it is "shame-word", or *porneia-logos*. It is well known that in Hebrew the term "word" (**DABAR**) is also used for "matter", "affair", or "thing". We need not labour this point. We all know the biblical expressions "Non est impossibile apud Deum omne verbum", or the shepherds' saying : "Videamus hoc verbum quod factum est." The expression in Deuteronomy therefore means "a matter of shame". The word **ERVATH** in Hebrew is always connected with something indecent or sexually shameful. The lax school of Hillel extended the meaning of the word in this text of Deuteronomy to anything in the woman which brought shame or disgrace to the husband, anything for which he would have to blush, were it even a mere defect in the wife which implied no guilt whatever. In consequence almost anything which displeased him might be used as a ground for divorce.

Now let us read Matthew xix : "There came to him the Pharisees tempting him, saying : Is it lawful for a man to put his wife away for *every* cause?" In other words : "Do you side with Hillel or with Shammai in your interpretation of the notorious term **ERVATH DABAR** in Deuteronomy?" They laid a snare for Him, since whatever answer He gave one of the rabbinical schools would be hostile to Him. In a similar way they had tempted Him in the matter of the coin of the tribute. In that case He would have embroiled himself either with the Herodians or with the strict Pharisees. They were testing this self-appointed rabbi from Galilee on the burning questions of the day.

In answer Christ quotes Genesis instead of Deuteronomy and proclaims the absolute indissolubility of marriage. His tempters are somewhat disconcerted but they insist : "What then of the text in Deuteronomy?" Christ answers : "Moses by reason of the hardness of your hearts permitted you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it was not so; hence I say to you that whosoever shall put away his wife—I set aside Deuteronomy's **ERVATH DABAR**—and marries another, committeth adultery."

Can *parektos* bear this meaning : "irrespective of, setting aside, independently of", or equivalent expressions? It is a very rare word. Outside the New Testament it is found only twice in the Greek literature of the period. In the *Didache* vi, 1, "Take heed lest any make thee to go astray from this way of teaching, seeing he teaches thee *parektos theou*", the meaning can only be "irrespective of God", "without His sanction". In the other known passage, *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Zabulon i, 4, *parektos ennoias* does not mean "except reason", but "outside, contrary to, reason".

St. Paul uses the term twice. In II Cor. xi, 28, *choris tōn parektos* refers to the troubles which came to the Apostle from outside, in contrast to the mental anxieties which came from within. In Acts xxvi, 2, St. Paul wishes all men to be like him *parektos tōn desmōn*. It might in this case be translate "except these bonds", but equally well "without these bonds" or even "notwithstanding these bonds". Thus the fundamental meaning of *parektos* seems to be "outside", i.e. "beyond, independently of", and hence "irrespective of".

If, with Fathers Dyson and Leeming, we suppose *μὴ* to be the real reading of Matthew xix, 9, is not the construction very odd? If we connect the negative with the word "whosoever" at the beginning of the sentence we should normally translate: "Unless a man send away his wife for *porneia* he commits adultery." This would bring the exception into the main clause and would put the man under the obligation of sending his wife away for this cause, so that if he continued to live with her he would commit adultery—which is nonsense.

Can the particle *μὴ* be used in a parenthesis and bear the meaning "except"? Certainly this clause is so cryptic as to have puzzled early commentators. This leads us to think that the *parektos* clause of Matthew v, 3 is the original attempt of the translator at rendering Christ's Aramaic word literally, while the words of Matthew xix, 9 are a freer rendering and a guess. If Christ said in Aramaic: "LEBAR MIN ERVATH DABAR", i.e., "irrespective of the meaning you choose to give to ERVATH DABAR", then the whole episode of Matthew xix runs smoothly and the words of Christ completely fit the circumstances in which the question was asked by His cunning and malevolent adversaries.

J. P. ARENDZEN.

HOMILETICS

The First Sunday in August

(For the Feast of the Transfiguration of Our Lord)

Text: *This is My beloved Son in Whom I am well pleased; bear ye Him.*
(Matt. xvii.)

THE TRANSFIGURATION is a Mystery of Our Lord's life which perhaps receives less attention than it deserves. It certainly loomed large in the thought of those who witnessed it (St. Peter, for example: 2 Peter i, 16-18).

What was the Transfiguration? A momentary anticipation of the glory of Our Lord's risen life; the welling up for a few brief moments of that glory which was the natural overflowing of His divine upon His human nature—the glory that pertained to His human Soul and Body by right of the Hypostatic Union from the first moment of the Incarnation, but which in order that He might be like to us in all things but sin, in order that He might suffer and die for us and so enter into His glory, Our Blessed Lord in obedience to His Father's Will forwent until the day of His Resurrection, then to receive it as the reward of His obedience unto the death of the Cross.

But what was the purpose, the significance of the Transfiguration?

(1) Undoubtedly to strengthen the faith of the three apostles, scandalized by the prospect of the Passion and Crucifixion, to make them look beyond the sorrow and disgrace of the Passion to the glory that should crown it and mark the Heavenly Father's acceptance of it. It was a harbinger of the Glory that was to be His from the dawn of the Resurrection morning throughout eternity.

(2) But the Transfiguration of Our Lord also has a meaning and a significance for *us* in our lives as Christians. For it is the type, the pattern of *our* Transfiguration in Grace. Just as the Resurrection of Christ is the pattern of our spiritual resurrection—by Baptism we die with Christ unto sin and rise again with Him unto justice and newness of life (St. Paul and the Easter liturgy)—even so *His* Transfiguration is the pattern of *ours*.

And what is *our* Transfiguration? The gradual unfolding in our souls of the life of grace, that seed of divine life which is implanted in our souls at Baptism; the gradual emergence in our lives of that Christlikeness which our Heavenly Father looks to see in us. The eliminating from our lives, our actions, our thoughts, our judgements, our values, our preferences, our outlook of all that is unChristlike; the putting off of the old man and his characteristics—worldliness, pride, vanity, impurity, immodesty, self-centredness, hardness, bitterness, hatred, dislikes, intolerance, impatience, etc.; in a word, of all those evil qualities which are part of our fallen human nature, which are the remains of original sin, which we have inherited from our first parents; the Old Man, in fact, with all his vices and concupiscences. And the putting on of the New Man, that is of Christ, His purity, patience, compassion, kindness, selflessness, but above all His Charity.

St. Paul uses the term twice. In II Cor. xi, 28, *choris tōn parektos* refers to the troubles which came to the Apostle from outside, in contrast to the mental anxieties which came from within. In Acts xxvi, 2, St. Paul wishes all men to be like him *parektos tōn desmōn*. It might in this case be translated "except these bonds", but equally well "without these bonds" or even "notwithstanding these bonds". Thus the fundamental meaning of *parektos* seems to be "outside", i.e. "beyond, independently of", and hence "irrespective of".

If, with Fathers Dyson and Leeming, we suppose $\mu\nu\eta$ to be the real reading of Matthew xix, 9, is not the construction very odd? If we connect the negative with the word "whosoever" at the beginning of the sentence we should normally translate: "Unless a man send away his wife for *pornai* he commits adultery." This would bring the exception into the main clause and would put the man under the obligation of sending his wife away for this cause, so that if he continued to live with her he would commit adultery—which is nonsense.

Can the particle $\mu\nu\eta$ be used in a parenthesis and bear the meaning "except"? Certainly this clause is so cryptic as to have puzzled early commentators. This leads us to think that the *parektos* clause of Matthew v, 3 is the original attempt of the translator at rendering Christ's Aramaic word literally, while the words of Matthew xix, 9 are a freer rendering and a guess. If Christ said in Aramaic: "LEBAR MIN ERVATH DABAR", i.e., "irrespective of the meaning you choose to give to ERVATH DABAR", then the whole episode of Matthew xix runs smoothly and the words of Christ completely fit the circumstances in which the question was asked by His cunning and malevolent adversaries.

J. P. ARENDZEN.

HOMILETICS

The First Sunday in August

(For the Feast of the Transfiguration of Our Lord)

Text : *This is My beloved Son in Whom I am well pleased ; bear ye Him.*
(Matt. xvii.)

THE TRANFIGURATION is a Mystery of Our Lord's life which perhaps receives less attention than it deserves. It certainly loomed large in the thought of those who witnessed it (St. Peter, for example : 2 Peter i, 16-18).

What was the Transfiguration ? A momentary anticipation of the glory of Our Lord's risen life ; the welling up for a few brief moments of that glory which was the natural overflowing of His divine upon His human nature—the glory that pertained to His human Soul and Body by right of the Hypostatic Union from the first moment of the Incarnation, but which in order that He might be like to us in all things but sin, in order that He might suffer and die for us and so enter into His glory, Our Blessed Lord in obedience to His Father's Will forwent until the day of His Resurrection, then to receive it as the reward of His obedience unto the death of the Cross.

But what was the purpose, the significance of the Transfiguration ?

(1) Undoubtedly to strengthen the faith of the three apostles, scandalized by the prospect of the Passion and Crucifixion, to make them look beyond the sorrow and disgrace of the Passion to the glory that should crown it and mark the Heavenly Father's acceptance of it. It was a harbinger of the Glory that was to be His from the dawn of the Resurrection morning throughout eternity.

(2) But the Transfiguration of Our Lord also has a meaning and a significance for us in our lives as Christians. For it is the type, the pattern of our Transfiguration in Grace. Just as the Resurrection of Christ is the pattern of our spiritual resurrection—by Baptism we die with Christ unto sin and rise again with Him unto justice and newness of life (St. Paul and the Easter liturgy)—even so His Transfiguration is the pattern of ours.

And what is our Transfiguration ? The gradual unfolding in our souls of the life of grace, that seed of divine life which is implanted in our souls at Baptism ; the gradual emergence in our lives of that Christlikeness which our Heavenly Father looks to see in us. The eliminating from our lives, our actions, our thoughts, our judgements, our values, our preferences, our outlook of all that is unChristlike ; the putting off of the old man and his characteristics—worldliness, pride, vanity, impurity, immodesty, self-centredness, hardness, bitterness, hatred, dislikes, intolerance, impatience, etc. ; in a word, of all those evil qualities which are part of our fallen human nature, which are the remains of original sin, which we have inherited from our first parents ; the Old Man, in fact, with all his vices and concupiscences. And the putting on of the New Man, that is of Christ, His purity, patience, compassion, kindness, selflessness, but above all His Charity.

So that just as Our Lord's Charity, having His Father as its primary and ourselves as its secondary object, inspired and gave meaning to His whole life and to all His sufferings ("My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me", "Did you not know that I must be about My Father's business?" "Greater love than this hath no man . . .", "I lay down My life for My sheep"), even so our lives—our prayers, our works, our sufferings—may all come to be inspired by the love of Christ, and, with Christ, of His and our Father in Heaven. Cf. the apostles after Pentecost. In all their subsequent labours, trials and sufferings they were sustained and held up by that immense flame of the love of Christ which the Spirit of Christ had enkindled in their hearts on the first Whit Sunday.

"The Charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Ghost Who is given to us." This charity is a spark enkindled in our hearts by the Holy Spirit from that immense fire of love which ever burns in the Sacred Heart of Jesus. By it we make to Our Lord a return of love, and join with Him and our Lady and the Saints in loving our Father in Heaven and our fellow men and women. This love, implanted in our souls at Baptism, brought to full growth by the graces of Confirmation, nourished by Christ Himself in Holy Communion, restored to us or recuperating its strength in Confession, is a "vis unitiva et assimilitiva". By it we are drawn ever closer to Our Blessed Lord, become ever more like Him, and enter ever more fully into all the dispositions of His Sacred Heart. So that Our Heavenly Father may look down upon us from Heaven, and seeing in our lives an ever-growing resemblance to His only-begotten Son may be able to say of us also: "These are My beloved children in whom am well-pleased." Then indeed are we transfigured in Christ.

The Second Sunday in August

The Assumption B.V.M.

(The Fourth Glorious Mystery of the Rosary)

How appropriate is the word "Mysteries" as applied to the events of the lives of Our Lord and of His blessed Mother! We talk of the Mysteries of Jesus and of Mary, of the Mysteries of the life, death and resurrection of the Son of God—those for example on which we meditate in the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

For these Events of Jesus and of Mary, all of them, contain depths and riches which our human minds, albeit illumined by supernatural faith and heavenly wisdom and understanding, can never in this life fully fathom. We can only recall them, adore them, love them and give thanks to God for them. Thus the ineffable sublimity implied in the Divine Maternity (1st, 2nd, 3rd joyful mysteries); the exaltation of St. Joseph, set in authority over the Mother of God and her divine Son (all the joyful mysteries); the perfect worship which God received from Mary and her Child during her pregnancy (2nd joyful mystery); the interior sorrows of Jesus and Mary (sorrowful mysteries).

Today, in view of next Thursday's feast, let us consider the 4th glorious mystery—the Assumption. Catholic doctrine has ever proclaimed and

handed down, Catholic faith has ever received and held that in the case of Mary, as in that of her Son, "God did not suffer His Holy One to see corruption". For her, as for Christ, the general resurrection, in which we shall all on the last day participate, was anticipated.

We honour our Lady above all the Angels and Saints for two reasons:

(1) Because God has so honoured her. In choosing her for His own Mother He has exalted her above all creatures. In honouring her as we do we are only following the example of God Himself.

(2) Because of the fullness of Grace and supernatural beauty with which God adorned her soul from the instant of her conception, a purity, a love, a Grace which befitted her to be the Mother of Christ.

Both these reasons bear upon the Assumption.

(1) How could that all-pure body, which for nine months had been in the most literal sense the dwelling-place of God Incarnate, have returned to dust and ashes?

(2) "Dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return." Were not these words the sentence pronounced upon *Sin*—original and actual? But our Catholic Faith proclaims that our Blessed Lady was by a special privilege of God, in view of the future merits of her divine Son, preserved immune from all stain of original sin. So much has been defined solemnly by the Vicar of Christ himself. But further, though it has never been "defined", it is the universal teaching and belief of the Church, not only that Mary's original innocence and Grace was never sullied by the slightest actual sin, but also that throughout her life she enjoyed that gift of Integrity which was our first parents' before their fall. How fitting then that this "Holy One of God", Mary, the immaculate Mother of Christ, should not "see corruption". And, we may remark, what a luminous illustration this is of the wonderful way in which the different truths of the Faith fit in with and harmonize one with another, forming a compact, homogeneous and beautiful whole. The Immaculate Conception, the Divine Maternity, the perpetual Virginity and the Assumption of our Lady—how wonderfully these doctrines of the Church with regard to Mary illustrate, explain, lead on to and flow from each other!

The dominant note of next Friday's feast is Joy: "Gaudemus omnes in Domino"; "Assumpta est Maria in caelum, gaudent Angeli"; "Hodie Maria Virgo caelos ascendit: gaudete"; "Gaudete, Maria Virgo: cunctas haereses sola interemisti in universo mundo". Let us rejoice with the whole Church, with the Angels, with our Lady herself, with her divine Son, with the Father and the Holy Spirit in the exaltation of the Blessed Virgin, the fitting climax to her previous Graces and prerogatives, and an example of the wonderful unity and harmony which pervades the whole of Revealed Truth.

The Third Sunday in August

The Assumption, continued (The Fifth Glorious Mystery)

The subject of this mystery may be said to be the Queenship of our Blessed Lady.

(1) Mary is the *Queen-Mother*. The Royal dignity of Christ is reflected

back upon His Mother. The fact that she is the Mother of Christ the King exalts her high above the whole Court of Heaven, above all the Angels and Saints, second only to her divine Son.

(2) Mary is also the *Queen-Consort*. No soul is so closely united to Our Lord, so truly His Bride, as is our Blessed Lady.

These two titles (Queen-Mother and Queen-Consort) denote a Queenship of honour. But Mary's Queenship is not only one of honour and exaltation; it is also a real, effective exercise of royal power and right. In other words (3) Mary is *Queen-Regnant*, or perhaps Co-regnant.

What does this mean? All of us, having suffered with Christ, will reign with Christ (St. Paul). Even here on earth we share in Christ's kingship and priesthood; we are a *royal priesthood* (I Peter, ii), He has made us a *kingdom* and priests to our God (St. John : Apoc. v).

And what does that mean? It means that by our communion in the charity of Christ (*erga Patrem et homines*) and in His sufferings, we share with Him in His work of winning and extending His kingdom. But no Christian has ever reproduced so faithfully the charity and the suffering of Jesus as did Mary throughout her life and especially at the foot of the Cross. And therefore no Christian, while on earth, so fully participates in His kingship as did our Blessed Lady.

But we will also and more fully reign with Christ in Heaven. Then by our prayers we will assist in the outpouring of Grace upon the human race and the conducting of souls to their supernatural end, namely Heaven—surely the chief function of the supernatural kingship of Christ. And here again our Lady is pre-eminent. Her intercession, her influence are universal. Hence she is most truly acclaimed as Queen of Heaven.

The kingship of Christ, unlike earthly kingships, is one not primarily of fear but rather of love. It is by love that He holds sway over the hearts of men. And by example. His chief Law is the norm, the example of His own most divine life. Even so Mary, too, sways our hearts by the love she inspires, and by the example of her own most truly Christlike sanctity, humility and purity.

It will be seen that Mary's Queenship and her Motherhood coalesce. A true king is the father of his people. The Roman emperor, Augustus was given the title "pater patriae", because he had saved his country from revolution and chaos and had provided so well for it and ruled it so wisely. Even so the Blessed Virgin is not only our Queen but also our Mother, both because she has co-operated so closely with her divine Son in saving us, and because from her throne high up in Heaven at the right hand of Christ she watches over us and assists us with all and more than a mother's love and care.

The Fourth Sunday in August

(On the Beheading of St. John the Baptist)

Next Friday the Church celebrates the martyrdom of the forerunner of Our Lord, St. John the Baptist. Therefore a few considerations about this great saint will not be out of place today. Our Blessed Lord Himself has testified to the greatness of the Baptist: "Among men born of women

there hath not arisen one greater than John the Baptist." And the Church follows His example, and names the Baptist first after Our Lady and the Angels in her prayers (e.g. the litanies, the Confiteor and the other prayers of the Mass). Clearly then St. John is one of the very greatest of the saints, and this both by reason of the place which he occupies in the Economy of the Incarnation and Redemption, and because of the corresponding grace and sanctity with which his soul was adorned by the Holy Spirit.

St. John is on the border-line of the Old and New Testaments. He belongs as it were to both. Nevertheless we tend to think of him as pertaining to the former rather than to the latter. We associate him rather with the austere severity of the Hebrew prophets than with the gentle Christlike charity of the Catholic saint. We dwell on the side of him portrayed in Matthew and Mark, rather than on that presented in Luke and John.

Surely this is a pity. St. John's indictment of the Jews, recorded in the first two Gospels, is no more severe than that of Christ Himself (cf. Matthew iii, 7 with Matthew xi, 20-4, and xxiii, 33). The greatness of the Baptist's sanctity must surely mean a pre-eminent resemblance to Our Blessed Lord; for after all, sanctity is nothing more or less than Christ-likeness. The greater the saint, the more will the resemblance of Christ glow in his soul and life. And how truly Christlike is the contrast between John's horror of sin and yet love of sinners; between his severity towards sinners in bad faith (the Jews in Matthew iii and Mark i) and his gentle sympathy towards repentant and well-disposed sinners, as were the soldiers and publicans in Luke iii. The inspiration of Our Lord's whole life, the force that sustained Him in all the labours, wearinesses, disappointments and sorrows of His sojourn here on earth, was His immense love for His heavenly Father and the joyous consciousness that by all those sufferings He was doing that "Father's business", restoring the Father's glory and making amends and reparation to the Father for all our outrages. Even so the inspiration of the Baptist's life, the thing that explains his prayer and penance during all those long years in the desert, his hatred of sin and hypocrisy, his zeal for souls, his self-effacing detachment (John iii, 27-30) and his dauntless courage and fortitude (Matthew xiv) was surely his wonderful love of Christ, that love which the Holy Spirit had first kindled in his heart at the Visitation. And here we may note (1) the part played by Our Lady in the sanctification of St. John and (2) that the sanctification of the Baptist in his mother's womb was a grace second only to that of the Immaculate Conception in the case of the Blessed Virgin.

But to return to St. John's love of Our Lord, how wonderful that love was may be seen from the third chapter of the fourth Gospel. There we read how the Jews drew his attention to the fact that the crowds who had followed him were now going after JESUS, hoping no doubt thereby to stir up jealousy and ill-feeling between Christ and His forerunner. But John answers with words which are a revelation of the love within his heart and an example for all those who work for souls: "You yourselves do bear me witness that I said, I am not the Christ, but that I am sent before Him. He that hath the bride is the bridegroom: but the friend of the bridegroom, who standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth with joy because of the bridegroom's voice. This my joy is therefore fulfilled. He must increase,

but I must decrease." Christ is the bridegroom of our souls, John is but the friend of the bridegroom; it is for him not to draw souls to himself, but to lead them on to Christ. Else he would be but a false friend. "He must increase, I must decrease." John lives not for himself, but for Christ. He has no desire to draw souls to himself. His joy is to see Jesus followed, served and loved. Gladly does he behold Andrew and the other disciple leave him and follow Our Lord. How different is this love and devotion of John's from the vanity and ambitions of the apostles! Love such as John's they only attained on the day of Pentecost. John would not have denied or deserted Our Lord as they did. In the midst of the hatred and opposition of His enemies, of the fickleness and want of faith of the crowds and of the self-love and worldly mindedness even of His own chosen disciples, what joy and comfort John's devotion and love must have given to the Heart of his Master!

And we, too, must think on St. John's love of Christ, and pray to him to obtain for us that we in our turn may love Our Lord as he did; that the love of Christ may come to inspire and transform our lives as it did his; that in our lives also the Heart of Jesus may be consoled for the indifference, the unresponsiveness and the hostility even of so many men.

The Fifth Sunday in August

(*Thirteenth after Pentecost*)

The lesson of today's Gospel is that of gratitude—gratitude to our Heavenly Father, to His Incarnate Son and to Their common Spirit for all Their benefits to us.

What is gratitude? Something deep-rooted and fundamental in our human nature, the instinctive urge and desire which we feel to make some return to those who have shown us kindness or love. It is one of the loveliest of human qualities. A person who is grateful attracts us, just as one who is ungrateful, who takes everything for granted, repels us.

But to no one do we owe so much as to our Father in Heaven and to His Divine Son. What return then can we make to God? What return does God look for from us? Surely our service, our trust and above all our love. What return does a mother seek from her child, but confidence and love.

And yet our service, our obedience, our love of Almighty God are at best so imperfect. How can they ever form an adequate return to Him? They are so unworthy of Him that we are almost ashamed to offer them to Him. But Our Blessed Lord in His immense love and pity has foreseen this difficulty on our part and has provided for it. He has bequeathed to us the all-holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The *Eucharist* we call it, the thanksgiving *par excellence*. For in the Mass all the immense devotion, love and gratitude of the Heart of Jesus towards His Eternal Father become ours to offer to that Father in return for all His love and benefits to us. Here at last we have an adequate thank-offering. And now we need feel no shame in uniting our own feeble imperfect love and devotion with those of the

Sacred Heart in holy Mass, and offering them, too, to His and our Eternal Father.

And then Christ comes into our hearts in holy Communion precisely in order to make them more like His own Heart, to perfect our love, devotion and gratitude, to make them less unworthy of His Father, to instil into our hearts the dispositions of His own most Sacred Heart.

Our Blessed Lord Himself, as well as the Father, is the object of our grateful love and devotion. All our lives as Christians should be inspired by the all-pervading desire to give a return of joy to the Heart of Christ—in our prayers, our worship, our daily lives and work, our sufferings. And this gratitude towards Our Lord should have an atoning, a reparatory character about it. For the love of Christ is so little known, and so ignored and made little of even by those who do know it, that we, Our Lord's chosen friends, should long to make amends to that pierced and broken Heart by a special attention, love and gratitude—an intention which we should have at all times, and especially on the First Fridays, on the Feast and during the month of the Sacred Heart.

G. D. CRAWFURD.

DOCTRINE FOR CHILDREN

TEACHING THE LIVES OF THE SAINTS

EDUCATIONALISTS tell us that to teach successfully a practical science a teacher must instruct, inspire, demonstrate and guide. The child must learn what to do and why he does it; his interest must be aroused so that he is eager and anxious for success; he must learn a technique by imitating his teacher; his early steps must be guided and his errors corrected before he is equipped to continue his researches and use his knowledge for his own ends. Religion, the cultivation of man's relations with God, is a practical science. It is a practical way of life. To teach religion, then, it is not sufficient merely to instruct and inspire. There must be demonstration and guidance. That is the difficulty.

A good teacher must show how the thing should be done. "Do as the teacher tells you" is not enough. Children need concrete demonstration. No teacher can escape from setting an example to his class. Children imitate instinctively. Even carefully hidden feelings affect them. If the teacher is careless, his lack of interest is mirrored by them. If he is insincere, they react to the ring of base metal in what he says. So too, his piety, his devotion, his sincerity, awaken corresponding feelings in them. But what teacher would dare to pose as a complete model to his class with the inspired confidence of St. Paul saying to the Corinthians "*Estote imitatores mei sicut et ego Christii?*" So the teacher seeks his models and examples elsewhere—first in the life and example of Christ and secondly in the lives of Christ's faithful servants who have demonstrated the following of Christ in their own varied circumstances of time, place and occupation.

For children the concrete examples of the lives of the saints are invaluable. Children love stories and are born hero-worshippers. They follow eagerly the adventures of the heroes of story-books or films. Interest gives rise to conscious and unconscious imitation. Not only in their make-believe play but in the very texture of their lives, their speech and actions take colour from their models. To capture this interest and to arouse this imitation is the task of the teacher who tries to demonstrate the imitation of Christ through the example of His saints.

An examination of the technique of children's stories should be his first step. Children, in their stories, want romance, not the love-interest of the adult but the romance of brave deeds, of stirring scenes, of great events in which the hero plays his part. The lives of the martyrs and of the great missionary Saints provide such "thrills" in abundance. They only need to be presented in the right way. Children must see the pictures in their stories—the clothes, the houses, the ships, the arms, the occupations of the peoples, their interests and their troubles. By such detail are the dry bones of history made to live. Teachers of secular history have long since given up trying to interest children in dates, treaties, acts of Parliament, even in wars and battles, except in terms of their effect on living, breathing personalities. The teacher of religion must learn from them. People, not things, interest children; but the people must be real. What Julius Caesar had for breakfast is of small historical importance, but

it becomes valuable if it makes Caesar come alive to children. St. Paul's tent-making (Acts xviii, 3), his smallness of stature that enabled him to be lowered from a window in a basket (II Cor. xi, 33), his sending for his cloak, books and parchments (II Tim. iv, 13)—such details add nothing to our knowledge of his inspired doctrine, but they help us to see the man in the midst of the "visions and revelations of the Lord" by which he was surrounded. "We also are mortals, men like unto you" (Acts xiv, 14).

Such details mean more to children than to us. They must be able to put themselves in the hero's place. The wood-cutter's son, not the fairy, is the focus of their attention. Psychologists tell us a lot, which we may or may not believe, about the influence of the "Cinderella motif" in literature. All must admit the almost universal appeal of the "success-story", the story of plain ordinary people triumphing in the face of enormous difficulties. Yet such are the stories of the saints and as such we should present them to children. These servants of God were ordinary people like ourselves, eating, drinking and sleeping as we do. They had the same difficulties that we have but they overcame not only these but the greater ones which God had chosen them to conquer. The sagas of the first missionaries in Pagan lands—of a Patrick, a Boniface, a Columbanus or a Francis Xavier—are adventure stories that not even the imagination of a Jules Verne or a Rider Haggard could conceive. Their heroes ventured amongst unknown lands and people. They heard new tongues, saw strange rites and customs, lived like St. Paul "in journeyings often, in peril of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils from my own nation, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the cities, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils from false brethren, in labour and painfulness, in much watchings, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness" (II Cor. xi, 26-7).

These are the very warp and woof of which adventure stories are woven and yet there is more. The stories of the saints are not stories of mere human endeavour and endurance. It was God's work which they were doing and it was His Will that His co-operation in that work and His pleasure in His servants should be manifested by miracles. Here, for children at least, are the "high-lights" of the stories, the intervention of the supernatural aiding weak human nature in impossible circumstances to do impossible things. The "cloak of invisibility", "Aladdin's lamp", the "Death Ray"—all these have held their interest enthralled at various stages of their lives, but these are but figments of the imagination and children regretfully acknowledge them as such. To the child's perennial question "Is it a true story?" the teacher of the lives of the saints can say "yes". He does not ask with Peter Pan, "Do you believe in fairies?" but "Do you believe in God?" The miracles which he describes are historical facts.

This means, of course, that teachers of religion should avoid mere "legends of the saints". They have little place in the teaching of religion. They can well be left to the bedtime storytellers of the Catholic household. There is enough and to spare of God's providence in the authenticated records without drawing on the products of pious imaginations. If a legend seems worth telling for its own beauty it should be carefully labelled as such. To mix fact with fiction can only cause confusion for the young.

The lives of the saints are not all dashing adventure stories. There are stories to suit all tastes—quiet stories of simple parish priests like the Curé d'Ars, of gentle nuns like Thérèse of Lisieux, of helpers of the sick like John of God, of champions of the poor like Vincent de Paul. From a thousand sources the teacher can draw to demonstrate a way of Christian life, a way of imitating Christ, suitable for all. So abundant is the material available that teachers need some principles of selectivity to direct their choice. The life of any saint is worth teaching for the virtues it demonstrates, but economy of time demands that the teacher select those of special interest to his pupils, or which he can best use to serve more than one purpose. Some groups suggest themselves at once—the companions of Our Lord, the Saints of the Mass, the patrons of the country, the diocese or the parish, saints with local associations and the patron saints of the children. All those have an obvious focus of interest and devotion to them should be fostered. Such groups are not mutually exclusive and indeed most of them will be found under the further headings of "saints whose lives exemplify particular virtues", "saints whose lives illustrate particular doctrines" and "saints through whose lives Church History may be taught".

The new Westminster Syllabus of Religious Instruction for Schools makes many suggestions of lives to be used in these ways. In the Junior School syllabus each section of doctrine mentions the life of some saint, either especially illustrating the doctrine taught (e.g. Second Year, Section 6: "Christ taught us to obey our parents and superiors: St. Philip Neri, Model of Obedience"), or through which the doctrine itself may be taught (e.g. Third Year, Section 5: "Baptism by martyrdom: The Forty Martyrs of Sebaste"). For the Senior School a four-year Course in "Church History through the lives of the saints" is outlined, but close inspection of the syllabus of doctrine will show that the Church History and Doctrine are not necessarily separate courses but can be taken as one. This can be seen by referring to the experimental course on Section 2 of the Doctrine—"By Faith we believe what God's Church teaches"—given at the end of this article. In it doctrine and Church History are worked into one course, mutually aiding each other. For Elementary School children the value of such a process is obvious. It gives them some idea of the history of the Church whilst presenting them with concrete examples to make clear the difficult technicalities of Chapter Two of the Catechism.

In using the lives of the saints to explain doctrine and demonstrate virtue, the teacher must not neglect to promote devotion and to encourage children to seek their aid. Lessons on the saints should close with a prayer—the Collect of the Mass of the Saint's feast or some prayer composed by the Saint. Feast days of Patron saints should be marked by some special, if simple, devotions—the story of the life, a hymn in his honour and, perhaps, the exposition of his picture or a relic during the day. Children should be encouraged to hear Mass or at least to visit the Church to ask his intercession and do honour to his work. Teachers must be careful, however, not to try to impose their personal devotions on the children. The multiplication of daily devotions, novenas, etc., should be avoided. Devotion to the saints is mainly an individual thing and children should rather be encouraged to find their own favourites. They might be asked, for instance, to find out something about their own patrons and speak

to the rest of the class on his feast day or a period might be set apart for "patron saints of the month".

In all teaching of the lives of the saints teachers must be careful to stress that although God seems to have chosen some to be special vessels of His grace so that "He gave some apostles and some prophets and other some evangelists and other some pastors and doctors for the perfection of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ" (Eph. iv, 11-12), yet "to everyone is given grace according to the measure of the giving of Christ" (Eph. iv, 7). Not all are called to be apostles or martyrs, but all are called to be saints and the way of sanctity is co-operation with the grace of God. "Whosoever are led by the spirit of God, they are the sons of God" (Rom. viii, 14).

EXPERIMENTAL COURSE ON THE NEW WESTMINSTER SYLLABUS

First and Second Years of the Senior School : the Catholic Faith

Section Two : "By faith we believe what God's Church teaches."

Lesson 1. Christ chose twelve men to be His apostles, Luke ix, 1-5; x, 17-20, *et al.* The calling of the twelve—their preparation for their mission—their preaching—the test of the apostles.

Lesson 2. Christ gave them the mission to preach His Gospel to the world, Matthew xvii, 16-20; Mark xvi, 14-20. Purpose of the mission (*a*) to bring the Faith to the world, (*b*) to bring grace (Baptism), the Mass and the Sacraments to all men.

Lesson 3. Christ taught them how His word would be received. Parable of the Sower, Luke viii, 4-15. Prophecy of their persecution, Luke xii, 2; xxi, 12-17.

Lesson 4. Christ sent the Holy Ghost to remain with them for ever. Mass of Whit Sunday : Gospel—The Promise, Luke vii, 23-31. Epistle—The Fulfilment, Acts ii, 1-11. C.Q. 78 to 82.

Lesson 5. After Pentecost the Apostles preached to the world. The First Sermon, Acts ii. First persecutions, Acts iv to ix. Stories of St. Luke and St. Barnabas.

Lesson 6. St. Stephen was the first martyr for the Faith. Life in the early Church; the Deacons; the work and death of St. Stephen, Acts vi, vii.

Lesson 7. A great persecutor became an Apostle. Early life of St. Paul—his conversion—his early preaching, Acts ix.

Lesson 8. St. Paul preached the Word far and wide. Stories of the missionary journeys and death of St. Paul.

Lesson 9. Christ's prophecy of persecution was fulfilled. The "hard soil" of the pagan world—the Church in the Catacombs—early martyrs : SS. Limus, Cletus, Clement, etc.

Lesson 10. Children and women set an example of courage for Christ's Stories of SS. Pancratius, Tarcisius, Agnes, Lucy, etc.

Lesson 11. All classes of people followed Christ even to death. Stories of SS. Sebastian, Cecilia, Laurence, Perpetua, etc.

Lesson 12. The blood of St. Alban was the seed of the faith in England. Story of St. Alban and the coming of St. Augustine.

Lesson 13. From Rome the faith spread all over Europe. Story of St. Patrick.

Lesson 14. Those who received it from Rome spread it further. Stories SS. Boniface, Aidan, Columbanus, etc.

Lesson 15. The first thousand years saw a great spread of the Faith. A map lesson showing the spread over Europe.

Lesson 16. The Church is the union of all the faithful under one Head. Church not a heap but an organized body—need of this unity—Christ the source of Grace. C.Q. 84, 85.

Lesson 17. Christ left a head to represent Him on earth, Story of St. Peter—His call, Matthew iv; Christ's words to him, Matthew xvi, Luke xii, John xxi; leader of the Apostles during Christ's life and after His death; preaching and death of St. Peter. C.Q. 88, 91.

Lesson 18. The successors of St. Peter are the Popes, Bishops of Rome. Need of a permanent Head; the work of the Pope; Pius XII.

Lesson 19. Christ's representative can never teach what is false. Christ's promise, Luke xxii, 24-34; need of authority; meaning of infallibility; how shown. C.Q. 91-3.

Lesson 20. The successors of the Apostles are the Bishops and Priests. The work of the Bishop; organization of the Church in parishes, dioceses, etc.; need of succession of orders.

Lesson 21. Christ's Church has four marks by which we know it. Obligation of belonging to the true Church, John x, 1-16. Church must be easily known; the signposts to the Church, marks. C.Q. 94.

Lesson 22. The Church of Christ must be one Church. Christ's teaching, John x, 11-16; need of unity of faith, Matthew xvii, 20; need of unity of worship and government; only the Catholic Church has this unity. C.Q. 95.

Lesson 23. The Church of Christ must be holy. Christ's Church must be like its Head, Ephesians v, 25-33. Its teaching is His teaching; its means of grace come from Him. Only the Catholic Church has this holiness. C.Q. 96.

Lesson 24. Christ's Church must be universal or Catholic. Christ's mission to His Church, Matthew xxviii, 16-20. Christ died for all, all must have access to His grace. Only the Catholic Church is universal. C.Q. 97, 98.

Lesson 25. The Catholic Church is Catholic in fact. Parable of the mustard-seed, Luke xiii, 18-21; Prophecy of Malachias, Malachy i, 11. Map to show universality.

Lesson 26. The Catholic Church still fulfils Christ's Mission. Work of the missions in Pagan Lands; how to help the missions; the duty of helping.

Lesson 27. The Church of Christ must be apostolic. Christ founded His church on His Apostles, Ephesians ii, 11-22. To them He gave the power to spread His Church; only they could pass on this power; only the Catholic Church has this succession. C.Q. 99.

Lesson 28. The Catholic Church holds the traditions and doctrines of the Apostles. Scripture and Tradition as rules of Faith; need of both; dangers of private interpretation.

Lesson 29. The Church of Christ cannot err in what it teaches. Christ's

promis
The Ho

Les
of Gen
Arianis

Les
errors.
Nazian

Les
of St.

Les
St. Je

Les
of St.

Les
sinne

Les
Story

Les
St. Be

Les
John a
a sain
died i

Les
of Sain
I Cori
—frat

Les
Saints

Les
Trium

[T]

article

Map-

(a)

Apos

(b)

Churc

Bookle

O

illust

Dram

O

marty

Bullet

P

promises to His Church, John xiv, 16-26 ; Matthew xvi, 18 ; and xxviii, 20. The Holy Ghost is its guide ; need of an infallible authority. C.Q. 100, 101.

Lesson 30. The General Councils of the Church are infallible. Meaning of General Council ; how the Church speaks ; Council of Nicea as example ; Arianism ; Nicene Creed.

Lesson 31. God raised up great teachers to help His Church to fight errors. The fight against Arianism in the lives of SS. Basil and Gregory Nazianzen.

Lesson 32. God's preachers spread the truth in burning words. Story of St. John Chrysostom, scholar and preacher.

Lesson 33. Great scholars studied and explained the Bible. Story of St. Jerome, Hermit and scholar.

Lesson 34. Christ's Teachers fearlessly resisted the evil of men. Story of St. Ambrose, Fighter and Scholar.

Lesson 35. God's Grace found Champions everywhere, even in sinners. Story of St. Augustine, sinner and saint.

Lesson 36. Successors of St. Peter organized the spread of the Faith. Story of Gregory the Great, Champion of the Missions.

Lesson 37. Where the faith was planted, schools arose. Story of St. Bede, glory of Anglo-Saxon England.

Lesson 38. Christ is the Head of the Church. Parable of the Vine, John xv, 1-2. Sanctifying Grace is the bond of union between members ; a saint is one who is in the state of grace—the saints are those who died in that state. C.Q. 102.

Lesson 39. The members of the Church are united in the Communion of Saints. Unity through Christ, John xvii, 11, 21, 22 ; Galatians iii, 26-9 ; 1 Corinthians x, 15-17. Meaning of Church Militant ; signs of the unity—fraternal charity, faith, etc. C.Q. 103.

Lesson 40. The members of the Church on earth are united to the Saints. Unity through Christ, Ephesians iv, 11-16. Meaning of Church Triumphant ; Signs of the unity—intercessions, miracles, etc. C.Q. 104.

[The other lessons in this section have no bearing on the present article.]

PRACTICAL WORK

Map-work

(a) Filling in blank maps to show the Missionary journeys of the Apostles.

(b) Preparation of a Catholic Map to show the universality of the Church, the Mass and the missions.

Booklets

Of the lives of the Saints ; of the Missions ; of texts, hymns, etc., illustrating the doctrines ; of prayers, devotions, etc.

Dramatizations

Of scenes from the New Testament and the lives of the Saints, e.g. the martyrdom of St. Stephen, SS. Ambrose and Theodosius, etc.

Bulletin-board

Picture summaries of the lessons, mission slogans, etc.

Notes

This course was taught by students of St. Mary's College, Strawberry Hill, in St. James's School, Twickenham. The entire course is planned for Two School Years, that is roughly eighty weeks. It is divided into eight sections so that each section has ten weeks or fifty lesson-periods. Sixty periods were given to this section on account of its apologetic value. The following books of reference were used :

C.T.S. *Lives of the Saints.*

The De Paul Course. Book VII. (De Paul University, Chicago.)

Drinkwater. *Teaching the Catechism and Catechism Stories.* (Burns Oates & Washbourne.)

Martindale. *Saints of the Mass ; Princes of His People.* (Burns Oates & Washbourne.)

Highway to Heaven Series ; The Vine and the Branches. (Coldwell.)

Eaton. *Our Inheritance.* (Longmans.)

Mother Salome. *Saints and Festivals.* (Burns Oates & Washbourne.)

Meleady. *Saints for Home and School.* (Dent.)

Raemers. *The King's Series.* Books VI to XIV.

The English Way ; The Irish Way. (Sheed & Ward.)

Laux. *Church History.* (Benziger.)

J. M. THOMPSON, C.M.

T
su
is a p
one f
ship o
Wash
prom
Smyth
the il
the n
liberty
class,
public
ness
"Free
necess
altern
shows
order
among
be qu

The
purpos
not fir
objecti
Conseq
decide

The
the C
God ;
cannot
of gove
this sp
people

In
Series'
Christ
Doctri
Editor
seems
Mediae
its titl
of the
of Inn

1 Cr

2 Cr

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. HISTORY

THE fashion of cheap and popular books on important and topical subjects is one which, for better or worse, has come to stay; and it is a pleasure to welcome two specifically Catholic ventures in this line, one from this country and one from America. Under the general editorship of his Grace the Archbishop of Liverpool, Messrs. Burns Oates & Washbourne have drawn up plans for a "Present Problems Series" which promises well, the first volume, *Our Present Discontent*, by Father J. P. Smyth, being a notable success.¹ Among the many attempts at diagnosing the ills of modern society this little book, following Papal teaching, has the merit of probing down to fundamentals: the denial of true human liberty through the denial of human dignity, the idolatry of nation or class, and the disregard of the authority and law of God in family and public life. The first four chapters are largely critical, exposing the foolishness of modern ideas and assumptions. The fourth chapter, entitled "Freedom and Order", is a clear, blunt, downright exposition of the necessity for law in all human activity, in politics and economics, as an alternative to the rule of force; and this law, Father Smyth brilliantly shows, is not a question of arbitrary choice by man, but is the law and order of nature, made by God and subject to Him. One sample from among many of Father Smyth's direct, concrete and challenging style may be quoted:

The shipbuilder does not make his craft, and then decide it will sail rather than fly. The purpose for which the vessel is made is expressed in its construction. Similarly, man was not first made without a purpose to attain . . . he was not created and then given an objective or purpose. The purpose for which he is made is expressed in his very nature. Consequently, from the fact that he did not make himself, we know that he cannot claim to decide the purpose of his being as though he were a god.

The concluding chapter shows where the Christian—one should say the Catholic—solution lies: in the love of God and the love of men in God; and Father Smyth has some excellent remarks on two points which cannot be sufficiently emphasized at the present time—that the machinery of government matters far less than the spirit of just government, and that this spirit will pervade governments only through the influence of the people. It is in this order that Catholics have a heavy responsibility today.

In America the Macmillan Company are publishing "The Christendom Series", described as "popular books on important topics in the history of Christendom, prepared under the auspices of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine". The name of Professor Ross J. S. Hoffman, as chairman of the Editorial Committee, compels attention, and the first book of the series seems to succeed admirably in achieving the purpose suggested. *The Mediaeval Papacy in Action*, by Marshall W. Baldwin, is aptly described by its title.² It is an attempt to sketch the character, organization and work of the Papacy from the accession of Pope Leo IX in 1049 to the death of Innocent IV in 1254. This was a great age, if not the greatest, for the

¹ Crown 8vo. Pp. 124. Paper covers, 2s., cloth boards, 3s. 6d.

² Crown 8vo. Pp. xiii + 113. The Macmillan Company, 4s. 6d.

Papacy, beginning with the remarkable recovery which culminated in the Hildebrandine reform and the Investiture controversy, the age, too, of St. Bernard and St. Dominic, of the crusades against both infidels and Albigenses, and of the establishment of the Inquisition. It was also the age of a much less spectacular achievement in the stabilization of Papal procedure and the forms of administration, and saw the first serious attempt to make a science of canon law. For this reason Mr. Baldwin's second chapter, "The Organization of the Papal Monarchy", is most welcome. The work of such experts as Mr. Barracough, Dr. Lunt, and Dr. Annie Cameron has advanced sufficiently far for its main lines to be determined, and for its results to be set out in simpler textbooks. This is what Mr. Baldwin has done. He explains the centralizing influences at work in papal administration, the importance of the use of legates, the organization of the *curia*, its financial workings and methods of collecting revenue, and gives a short account of the codifications of canon law. The third chapter, entitled "The Papacy in Action", is not quite so successful, chiefly because it is far more difficult to compress the story of events in Europe during these centuries into a few pages than it is to summarize the trends of organization and development of ideas. The last pages of Mr. Baldwin's book are very heavily loaded, and the lines of the picture are not always clearly drawn. Yet as a whole this is a useful book, and the survey of Papal administration is one of the best short accounts that I know.

Another series of books entitled "Signposts", the work of a number of Anglican clergymen chiefly associated with Lincoln Theological College, has been given much favourable if qualified comment in these pages. The series of twelve books has now been completed with *The Faith in England* by A. Herbert Rees.¹ The author describes his book as "in the nature of an epilogue"; and it is in fact a disappointing epilogue, confirming the fears that have been felt about the whole series. Once more we have the old theory expounded, that the Reformation produced no essential change in the Church in this country and that the faith of the Elizabethan Establishment is in essentials the same faith as that brought over to Kent by St. Augustine in 597. The presentation of such a thesis involves an ingenuous refusal to face the fundamental issues, a policy of ignoring difficulties, and a whole series of debatable assumptions, false suggestions and half truths with a fair sprinkling of downright inaccuracies. It is possibly a waste of time to treat this attitude as serious history, but a few examples may show some of the defects of the book. The statement on p. 67, that Bishop Ridley believed not only in the real presence of Jesus Christ in the Blessed Sacrament, but also in the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, is simply not true. Ridley probably admitted a "virtual" presence of Christ, though he may have held some form of Lutheran doctrine. Certainly his own words, both in Parliament in 1548 and at Oxford in 1554, affirm clearly that "the substance of the bread remains as it was before".² There is no

¹ Crown 8vo. Pp. 188. The Dacre Press. Paper covers, 1s.

² It is Ridley's own comparison that "the bread indeed sacramentally is changed in the Body of Christ, as the water of Baptism is sacramentally changed into the fountain of regeneration, and yet the material substance remaineth all one, as was before". See the analysis of Ridley's opinions in *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*, and in *Messenger: The Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood*, II, 97-102.

mention that Ridley calls the Mass a "crafty juggling", but the author maintains that the Reformers were all the time attacking, not the Mass, but false notions associated with the expression "sacrifices of Masses"—as though the expression *Missarum sacrificia* had not been very properly used both by the Council of Florence and the Council of Trent. In this connection the reference to De Lugo on page 39 is completely misleading. One might multiply instances of this kind, such as the reference to Archbishop Chichele on page 31, the odd suggestion made about Leo XIII's Encyclical *Satis Cognitum* on page 89, or the reference to the number of clergy who conformed to the rites of the new Prayer Book, where, for instance, Dom Norbert Birt's patient analysis of the Northern and Southern visitations is dismissed with the remark that "the evidence for this is not forthcoming". Above all, the fundamental problem of Orders and the Ordinal is hastily slurred over, and not squarely faced. On reading this book the innocent might wonder why the Reformation caused such a fuss in this country, and might well conjure up a vision of that fictitious personality the Church of England strenuously resisting all the attempts of the Reformers to change her faith or materially alter her worship. I am reminded of Florence Nightingale's remark to Manning, that "the English have never been historians. Instead of Saints they have had great Civil Engineers, instead of Sisters of Charity they have had Political Economists. The Church of England could not have stood in any country but England, because she is such a poor historian." And it was doubtless a malicious imp which turned my attention, on putting down this book, to the account in the Church of England's oldest newspaper of Mr. Kensit's address at the May meeting of the Protestant Truth Society. I wonder how much he would agree with this interpretation of the Faith in England.

Two books dealing with different aspects of the Reformation in this country call for some comment. *The Tudors and Stuarts*, by M. M. Reese, is a competent, fair, well-written, lively and up-to-date textbook written by the Head of the History Department at Wellington College.¹ Although open to criticism on a number of points, chiefly details or questions of emphasis, this is really a very fair presentation of the problems raised in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Mr. Reese is severe in his estimate of Wolsey, and somewhat harsh to James II, whose failure, however, he roundly attributes to his "obstinate devotion to the Catholic religion". He too readily accepts the thesis that the Elizabethan government did not persecute before 1571, and that "the nation" did not want to return to Rome in 1553. On the other hand there is a sober and generous defence of Queen Mary, a clear acknowledgement of the anguish of conscience caused by the conflict of the new national sovereign state with the claims of the Church, and an excellent estimate of the Puritan influence, particularly in the social order. Perhaps Mr. Reese's most suggestive remark is that "in Tudor England a change took place in the psychology of ownership", for the effects of that change are heavy on us still. One must also congratulate Mr. Reese on his skilful use of contemporary quotation and on the excellent page-head summaries which are a feature of his book.

¹ Crown 8vo. Pp. 440. Edward Arnold & Co. 6s.

Spanish Tudor, by Miss H. E. M. Prescott, is a fine and very full study of "Bloody Mary" written from original sources, and coloured with a feminine perception of detail, ranging from the red damask skirt in which Anne Boleyn went to her execution to the shape and form of Mary's signature.¹ The tone of the book is in sympathy with that of Mary's life, dignified, sombre and a little sad. The account of how Mary was beaten down into a nominal acceptance not only of the Royal Supremacy, but of the statement that her mother's marriage had been "incestuous and unlawful" is moving in the emphasis it lays on her loneliness and isolation. Those summer months at Hunsdon in 1536 are seen by Miss Prescott as culminating in a crisis which was to mark Mary for the rest of her life.

The question of the Marian persecution is treated with great fairness and at considerable length. Miss Prescott gives full weight to the many reasons which could have prompted Mary to take strong action; and Cecil's later defence of the heretics is given short shrift. "Years after, William Cecil was to state explicitly that those who were burned, 'never at their death denied their lawful Queen, nor maintained any of her open and foreign enemies, nor procured any rebellion or civil war, nor did sow any sedition in corners'. It was a bold denial, but it was, so I believe, a lie." Mary had in fact to face "a huge and growing mass of disorder and rebellion", and it was, in the event, a tragedy that she made its repression turn on the religious issue. Miss Prescott does not absolve Mary from responsibility for the persecution. She absolves Pole, at least so far as positive influence is concerned, and allows that if Gardiner was the initiator of harsh measures he was also quickly discouraged by their lack of success. It is on Philip that she seems to lay the heaviest responsibility, and her argument is weighty if somewhat ingenuous. It is interesting to note that Mr. Reese follows the more usual course of absolving Philip, and lays the blame on Mary, and chiefly on Pole. Mary's reign was tragic in so many ways, and her own life frustrated and disappointed. Yet it is on a note of peace that Miss Prescott closes her story. "All that Mary did was undone, all she intended utterly unfulfilled. But, as her body, without its inhabiting soul, lay stiff and still in the empty palace of St. James, deaf to the clatter of the horses' hoofs as the last hastily departing courtiers rode up the hill to take the Edgware Road, her soul surely had come into peace. For, mistaken often, almost always misguided in her public office, with much blindness, some rancour, some jealousy, some stupid cruelty to answer for, she had yet trodden, lifelong and manfully, the way that other sinners know. If her enemies could have brought her, as Pharisees brought another woman, to Christ, in the temple at Jerusalem, He might again have stooped down, written in the dust, and then, looking up, dismissed them with the same unanswerable word."

ANDREW BECK, A.A.

II. ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY

The war has reduced our list of books to two only : St. Thomas More's *History of the Passion*, and *Highways to Holiness*, by the Rev. James F. Cassidy, B.A. The *History of the Passion*¹ was the last of the large output of works

¹ Demy 8vo. Pp. xv + 362. Constable & Co. 18s.

in Latin and English with which More enriched the controversial and spiritual literature of his time. The first part of the *History* was written in English. It was printed in the volume of More's English works which William Rastell published and dedicated to Queen Mary in 1557. It has never been reprinted, but will presently appear in the new complete edition of the English Works which Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode are publishing. The second part of the *History* was in Latin and was first printed at Louvain in the collected volume of More's Latin works. Soon it was translated into English, by Mary Basset, Margaret Roper's daughter and More's granddaughter, and published in the collected English Works, along with the English first part, in 1557. It is this English version of the second part which has just been republished, with modernized spelling and punctuation, under the careful and devoted editorship of Mgr. Hallett.

The *History* is very incomplete. It covers only the narrative of the Agony in the Garden, from Our Lord's departure from the Supper Room to His arrest by the soldiers and satellites. At that point the emissaries of the king took away all More's books and writing materials, and he was able to write no more. The book is a leisurely commentary on the Gospel text, arranged according to the *Monatessaron* or Concordance of the well-known John Gerson, whom More regarded as "an excellent learned man, and a gentle handler of a troubled conscience". Mingled with the commentary, which may be called standard in its treatment, there are remarks, passages and digressions, in which More's natural and supernatural qualities of soul, his caustic wit, wisdom, and above all his spirit of living faith shine out. Incidentally, too, there are sidelights on the lack of a religious spirit among many of More's contemporaries.

Thus : "And albeit we would have it seem that on the holy days we go more gorgeously appalled than at other times only for the honour of God, yet the negligent fashion that we use a great many of us, in the time of our prayer, doth sufficiently declare . . . that we do it altogether of a peevish worldly pride. So carelessly do we even in the church somewhiles solemnly jet (i.e. strut) to and fro, and other whiles fair and softly set us down again. And if it hap us to kneel, then either do we kneel upon the one knee, and lean upon the other, or else will we have a cushion laid under them both, yea and sometime . . . we call for a cushion to bear up our elbows too, and so like an old rotten ruinous house, we be fain therewith to be stayed and underproped. And then further do we every way discover, how far wide our mind is wandering from God. We claw our head, we pare our nails, we pick our nose and say therewhiles one thing for another, since what is said or what is unsaid both having clean forgotten, we be fain at all adventures to aim what we have more to say" (p. 26).

Again : "But now here cometh to my remembrance another point besides, which is, that Christ is then delivered into the hands of sinners, whensoever his blessed body in the holy sacrament is consecrated and handled of beastly, vicious, and most abominable priests. As often as we see any such case fall (and fall doth it, alas, too oft a great deal) let us reckon that Christ himself then speaketh these words unto us afresh : 'Why sleep you? Watch, arise, and pray, that you enter not into temptation, for

¹ Messrs. Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd. Pp. xxiii + 134. 6s.

the Son of Man is delivered into the hands of sinners'. For doubtless by the lewd (i.e. wicked) examples of naughty priests doth vice and evil living lightly increase and creep in among the people. And the unmetter they be (whose office it is to watch and pray for the people, to obtain God's gracious help for them) the more need perdy the people hath to watch, rise, and heartily pray for themselves, and yet not for themselves only, but for such priests also, since greatly were it for the behoof of the laity, that evil priests were amended" (p. 76). If St. Thomas is not exaggerating in these statements (and who shall say he was, for he was writing at the solemn crisis of his life?), then one is not surprised at the success of the Reformation. With a notable number of the clergy unfaithful to their high calling, and the leading laity bored and unprayerful, there was little hope for a firm stand against the coming storm. More felt some share in Our Lord's agony of soul as he thought of these things in the light of the Passion.

The Saint had the Passion before his eyes constantly during his imprisonment. He had finished with controversy. He must prepare his own soul for its crisis; and what better preparation than to think of that Sacred Death from which all martyrdom took its rise? For all his merry courage, More knew how much he dreaded pain. "Surely, Meg," he wrote, "a fainter heart than thy frail father hath canst thou not have. And yet I verily trust in the great mercy of God, that he shall of his goodness so stay me with his holy hand that he shall not finally suffer me to fall wretchedly from his favour." Devotion to the Passion had indeed been a lifelong feature of his piety. Stapleton, in his life of More, tells us that every year on Good Friday he called together the whole of his family into what was called the New Building, and there he would have the whole of Our Lord's Passion read to them. From time to time More would interrupt the reading with a few words of pious exhortation. From this lifetime of meditation on Christ's sufferings the Saint moved naturally to his own end. When he took up his pen to write down his thoughts on the Passion, the thoughts flowed spontaneously from the fullness of his heart. Approaching martyrdom merely showed how deeply More had already drunk of the spirit of Christ suffering. He was a saint, not only because he bore the supreme witness of death to the Faith, but also because even in the years of prosperity he had been given to know nothing but Jesus Christ and Him crucified.

Of Mistress Basset's translation of the *History* the original printer wrote that it is "so set out in our tongue, and goeth so near Sir Thomas More's own English phrase that the gentlewoman (who for her pastime translated it) is no nearer to him in kindred, virtue, and literature, than in his English tongue. So that it might seem to have been by his own pen indited first, and not at all translated. Such a gift hath she to follow her grandfather's vein in writing." Subsequent authorities have been inclined to agree with this verdict. It is an excellent translation, though considerably longer than the original Latin.

Fr. James F. Cassidy's *Highways to Holiness*¹ is not, as its title might suggest, a statement of certain fundamental principles of the spiritual life. It is a series of six character sketches of famous saints, originally published in the *Irish Catholic*. The characters are strongly and vividly drawn.

J. CARTMELL.

¹ Dublin. The Talbot Press. 15.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

PRO-SUBDEACON

In the Dominican rite at High Mass the subdeacon at the Offertory offers the chalice and paten (containing the oblations, bread and wine) to the deacon, who then passes them to the celebrant. Should a pro-subdeacon not yet tonsured do this? He neither wears the maniple nor prepares the chalice. (F.C.)

REPLY

(i) As in many other practices, the Holy See has been progressively liberal in permitting the office of subdeacon to be performed by one not in major orders. In 1713, n. 2221, permission was refused to certain canons in minor orders; in 1784, n. 2525, the practice was forbidden "extra casum absolutae et praecisae necessitatis". On the other hand, rather than tolerate the French custom of chanting a solemn Mass with the assistance of a deacon only, the Archbishop of Cambrai was instructed, in 1853, to use a cleric in minor orders as subdeacon.¹ Up to 1906 some real and urgent necessity was required to justify the practice. The decree of 10 (14) March, 1906, n. 4181, which is the present discipline on the subject, merely requires any reasonable cause, which would be, for example, just the desire to have a solemn Mass; but it would, in our view, be unreasonable to make use of this permission if a cleric in major orders can easily be obtained.

(ii) In all the official texts and commentaries we have consulted the rule is rigidly maintained, as expressed in 4181 ad I, that the pro-subdeacon must at least be tonsured. It is purely a matter of positive law, and it is quite possible that the Dominicans and other regulars enjoy an indult permitting a non-tonsure person to act as pro-subdeacon, e.g. a professed subject of the Order. We have even heard of parish priests authorizing an ordinary lay server to perform the office. But we know of no justification for this practice in the common law as interpreted by canonists and liturgists of repute. On the contrary, the Franciscans were instructed, 22 July, 1848, n. 2965, ad 3, that a regular, even in cases of necessity, must not perform this office unless he is a cleric, a ruling summarized by Ojetta "debet necessario esse clericus, etsi sit regularis".² But we should be glad to know if there are any texts or arguments in favour of employing a non-tonsure person for this office.

(iii) As to what is permitted a cleric pro-subdeacon on these occasions, the principle seems to be, as far as matters of this kind can be reduced to a principle, that he may not do any of the things which are specifically the office of a subdeacon, under the penalty of possibly incurring the irregularity of Canon 985.7. This office is described in the Ordination rite as follows: "Subdiaconum enim oportet aquam ad ministerium altaris preparare; Diacono ministrare; pallas altaris et corporalia ablucere; Calicem et Patenam in usum sacrificii eidem offerre". Hence n. 4181 rules that he

¹ The decree is not in *Decreta Authentica*. Cf. *L'Ami du Clergé*, 1924, p. 105.

² Synopsis, s.v. *Subdiaconus*.

must not wear a maniple ; that he must not, before the Offertory, wipe the chalice and pour the water therein—this is to be done by the deacon ; that, after bringing the chalice to the altar, he must not touch it during the Canon nor remove and replace the pall ; finally, that after the ablutions he must not wipe the chalice—this is to be done by the celebrant.¹

The directions are quite clear for a solemn Mass celebrated according to the common Roman rite. Dominicans and some other regulars have a rite which varies, in some particulars, from that of the Roman Missal. The chalice is prepared at the *sedilia* between the epistle and gospel ; after the offertory has been read, both deacon and subdeacon cross over to the epistle side, where the latter, having removed the veil and pall, presents the prepared chalice to the deacon, who offers it to the celebrant. It is quite clear that a pro-subdeacon must not prepare the chalice at the *sedilia* ; he carries the chalice and paten with the host to the celebrant and deacon seated there, and the deacon pours in the water and wine.

The only question, therefore, is whether a pro-subdeacon should at the offertory present the prepared chalice to the deacon. We have found no discussion of the point amongst the writers on the subject, but we think he should not do so since the Ordination rite describes one of the duties of the subdeacon to be : “*Calicem et Patenam in usum sacrificii eidem (diacono) offerre*”.

E. J. M.

BREVIARY OBLIGATION

A priest finds himself subjected throughout the whole day to an unusual din of traffic which makes it impossible for him to give to the Office the requisite degree of attention. Is he, nevertheless, bound to its recitation in these circumstances ? (D. C.)

REPLY

The point in this query is not whether the Office can be said well under these conditions, but whether it can be said at all owing to the lack of necessary attention. If the answer is that the Office is not being said, and cannot be said, with the minimum of attention necessary, it must follow that the priest is not bound to fulfil the obligation.

In defining the kind of *attention* required, if the substance of a public and official prayer is to be preserved, the writers are in agreement that it must be the kind which is called “external”, by which is meant that the person praying must not be engaged, at the same time, in performing some external action which is incompatible with that of praying. Even though this external attention is present, the action of praying may be badly and even sinfully performed owing to culpable distractions ; but the opinion is at least solidly probable that the lack of “internal” attention does not destroy the substance of the act. Therefore, in our view, a priest in the above circumstances is not excused solely because internal attention is impossible.

¹ The text in *Decreta Authentica*, Vol. VI, appendix I (1912) differs slightly from its original form as printed in *Periodica*, II, n. 126.

But a better and a simpler solution of the difficulty may be found, perhaps, by using the principle that one may be excused from this obligation owing to the moral impossibility of performing it. It is physically possible, indeed, but attended by such great difficulty that the positive law is held not to bind. All moral impossibility is relative to the person affected and must be decided by his conscience : it is always recommended in such cases that one should seek the sanction of a superior or of a confessor. Personally we would not recognize any moral impossibility in a situation such as that described, unless the priest's nervous reactions to noise were so abnormal as to be equivalent to the kind of illness which may excuse one from reciting the office on that ground. Cf. Prümmer, *Theol. Moralis*, II, §355.

E. J. M.

CENSURE AND GENERAL ABSOLUTION

During an air-raid a person is absolved by general absolution. In his repentance at that time was included a sin to which a censure reserved to the Ordinary is attached. When this sin is confessed orally what should the confessor do about the censure ? (T.C.)

REPLY

Assuming that the censure was incurred, the situation is that it was absolved *in periculo mortis*. From Canon 2252 the obligation of recourse to the competent superior arises, in such cases, only when the censure is one which is reserved "ab homine" or reserved *specialissimo modo* to the Holy See. Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1932, IV, p. 274.

The fact that the absolution in this case was a general one does not modify the doctrine, but any doubt there may be is removed by the explicit statements in the formula of faculties issued to Army Chaplains, which was commented upon in this journal, 1940, XVIII, p. 304. It will be seen that the faculty to absolve from reserved censures in n. 13 of this document is extended to general absolutions, but everyone absolved in this manner must be instructed to mention the sins absolved by general absolution when next they go to confession : "Ne omittant vero poenitentes docere absolucionem ita receptam non esse profuturam, nisi rite dispositi fuerint, eisdemque obligationem manere integrum confessionem suo tempore peragendi."

The duty, therefore, of the confessor who receives this confession is quite clear. No recourse to the Ordinary is required, but he must assure himself that the penitent is willing to comply with the requirements of the church—conveniently described as *in iunctis de iure iniungendis*—which will differ according to the case. The censure, for example, incurred from Canon 2319 §1, 3, through educating one's children as non-Catholics, requires for its absolution that the children shall henceforth be educated as Catholics. If the penitent seriously promises to do this, everything is in order ; if he culpably refuses to do so, he is under the censure and must be refused absolution ; and, indeed, if he was in this state of mind at the time when general absolution was received it was wholly ineffective.

E. J. M.

RE-INCURRED CENSURE

A censure reserved to the Ordinary but absolved under Canon 2254 §1 is re-incurred if the penitent fails to have recourse to the competent superior within a month. May this re-incurred censure also be absolved under the same canon? (T. C.)

REPLY

We have not found this precise situation discussed by the commentators, but the solution seems quite clear. It will be necessary, in the first place, for the second confessor, who is dealing with a case of non-compliance with the law, to decide whether as a matter of fact the censure has been re-incurred. He will come to a decision exactly as he would in examining any other *delictum* to which is attached a censure *l.s.*, and he will make a special point of discovering whether the penitent knew that a censure was attached to culpable non-compliance with the law of recourse within a month. Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1932, III, p. 42.

If the decision is that the censure has been re-incurred, there is no reason against its absolution according to the procedure of Canon 2254 §1, for the law contains no exception and *in poenis benignior est interpretatio facienda*. Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1932, IV, p. 279. The penitent must again be warned that the censure will be re-incurred unless recourse to the competent superior is had within a month.

If, on the other hand, the decision is that the censure has not been re-incurred, there remains the obligation of recourse to the competent superior arising from the previous absolution; the time limit is "ad urgendum, non ad finiendum obligationem".¹

E. J. M.

TIME FOR DISCHARGING MASS OBLIGATIONS

What is the present law regarding the time within which Mass obligations must be discharged? (F.)

REPLY

Canon 834, §1. Missae pro quibus celebrandis tempus ab oblato exprresse praescriptum est, eo omnino tempore sunt celebrandae.

§2. Si oblato nullum tempus pro Missarum manualium celebratione expresse praescripserit: (1) Missae pro urgenti causa oblatae quamprimum tempore utili sunt celebrandae. (2) In aliis casibus Missae sunt celebrandae intra modicum tempus pro maiore vel minore Missarum numero.

§3. Quod si oblato arbitrio sacerdotis tempus celebrationis expresse reliquerit, sacerdos potest tempore quo sibi magis placuerit, eas celebrare, firma praescripto can. 835.

¹ Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome*, III, §454.

Canon 835. Nemini licet tot Missarum onera per se celebrandarum recipere quibus intra annum satisfacere nequeat. See also Canon 841.

(i) The terms of the law in Canon 834 are perfectly clear, and in fact deducible from the natural law of contracts, with the exception of the phrase of §2. 2, "intra modicum tempus". The majority of the commentators interpret this phrase according to the rule of *Ut Debita*, 11 May, 1904, n. 2, a decree which was circulated in an English version to the clergy at the time: "Whatever may have been the teaching of theologians in the past as to the time within which Masses were to be said, whether for the living or for the dead, the Holy See now lays down a definite rule for all Masses. The rule is that the time available for the celebration of one Mass is a month, for the celebration of a hundred Masses six months, and for the celebration of a larger or a smaller number of Masses than a hundred, a proportionately longer or shorter space of time. No priest is at liberty to accept more than he can probably say within the space of a year." The Holy See¹ in the following year declined to impose a more specified determination of this time limit, answering: "Rem relinqu discreto iudicio et conscientiae sacerdotum iuxta decretum, et regulas a probatis doctoribus traditas." Applying the rule of Canon 6.4, the following hold that the time limits of *Ut Debita* are still of obligation: Cappello, *De Sacramentis* (1938), n. 683; Marc-Gestermann, *Theologia Moralis*, II (1934), n. 1611; Noldin, *De Sacramentis* (1935), n. 189; Genicot-Salsmans, *Theologia Moralis*, II (1936), n. 230. It is, in fact, such a usual interpretation of the law by the manualists that most priests take it as being obviously correct and certain, and there is, of course, every reason for preserving a mode of reckoning which makes for the prompt discharge of Mass obligations.

(ii) It is, nevertheless, somewhat remarkable that the Code uses the vague phrase "intra modicum tempus", instead of the precise reckoning of *Ut Debita*, and it can, we think, be safely held with Keller² that the Code "omitted the latter phrase intentionally in order to deprive the old decree of its binding character". It would have been quite simple to have preserved "infra mensem", as in Canon 2254, if the legislator had so desired. Accordingly, not only Keller—a recognized authority on the subject—but some other writers of repute are of the opinion that the time reckonings of *Ut Debita* are now merely *directive* not *preceptive*. Thus Prümmer, *Theologia Moralis*, III (1933), n. 266: "Quae igitur hac de re statuta fuerant Decreto *Ut Debita* iam amplius non habent nisi valorem directivum." Cf. also in almost identical terms Aertnys-Damen, *Theologia Moralis*, II (1939), n. 209; and less clearly Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome* II (1934), n. 106, and Wernz-Widal, *Jus Canonicum*, IV (1934), n. 85: "Prudenter censeri potest tempus unius mensis pro una Missa etc."

E. J. M.

NECESSITY OF INSTALLATION

Is the installation of a newly appointed parish priest so necessary and essential that without it he cannot validly perform the functions of his office, e.g. assistance at marriages? (Parochus.)

¹ A.C. Concilii, 27 February, 1905; *Fontes* n. 4322.

² *Mass Stipendi*, 1926, p. 151.

173415

REPLY

Canon 11: Irritantes aut inhabilitantes eae tantum leges habendae sunt, quibus aut actum esse nullum aut inhabilem esse personam expresse vel equivalenter statuitur.

Canon 461: Curam animarum parochus obtinet a momento captæ possessionis ad normam can. 1443-45.

Canon 1443, §1: Nemo possessionem beneficii sibi collati aut propria auctoritate capiat, aut non emissa fidei professione, etc.

Canon 1444, §1: Missio in beneficii possessionem fiat secundum modum iure peculiari praescriptum, vel legitima consuetudine receptum, nisi iusta ex causa Ordinarius ab eo modo seu ritu expresse in scriptis dispensaverit; quo in casu haec dispensatio locum tenet captæ possessionis.

Canon 1095, §1.1: Parochus et loci Ordinarius valide matrimonio assistunt a die tantummodo adeptae canonicae possessionis beneficii ad normam can. 334, §3; 1444, §1, vel initi officii. . . .

(i) The manner of installation to a parochial benefice was discussed recently in this REVIEW, May, 1941, p. 456, and though our first reaction to the above question was in a negative sense, an examination of the above canons and of the commentators thereon compels the conclusion that a newly appointed parish priest cannot *per se* validly perform functions, such as assisting at marriage, unless he is either installed or expressly dispensed from this rite. Claeys-Bouuaert, *Manuale Iuris Canonici*, I, n. 569: "Immissione in possessionem seu *installatio* requiritur ut iurisdictio valide exerceatur." Cappello, *Periodica*, 1929, xviii, p. 149: "Deficiente huiusmodi *expressa* dispensatione in *scriptis* data, deest canonica possessio, ideoque parochus *per se* non fruitur iuribus spiritualibus ac temporalibus, quae paroeciali beneficio adnexa sunt." Cf. also Fanfani, *De Iure Parochorum* (1936), n. 124; Cancé, *Le Code*, n. 404. The reason for this practically universal teaching is that Canon 461 is seen to be equivalently an invalidating law, by comparing it with the other canons cited above, and with Canon 2394 which, amongst other penalties for occupying a benefice "propria auctoritate", states that the person is "ipso iure inhabilis". Cf. *Homiletic Review*, March, 1935, p. 579.

(ii) We must not, however, too readily concede that the parish priest's actions are actually invalid because of this legal defect, for there are many considerations which argue the contrary. Common error, for example, could be held to supply jurisdiction, as Cappello maintains in *Summa Iuris Canonici*, n. 502: "Si possessio illegitime capta fuisset, *per se* nulla et irrita foret ideoque actus a parocho positi invalidi essent. Practice tamen eorumdem validitas sustineri posset ob errorem communem, seu ex praescripto can. 209." Custom also, if centenary or immemorial, could be invoked against the law of Canon 461 in accordance with Canon 5, though it is not, perhaps, applicable to a country where parishes have existed only since the Code was introduced. Moreover, it is the common practice to appoint a priest as "vicarius oeconomus" before making him "parochus", and it could be maintained that his powers as "oeconomus" continue until he is validly in possession as "parochus". There is, lastly, as a final safe-

guard, the principle of Canon 209 by which the Church supplies jurisdiction "in dubio positivo et probabili sive juris sive facti". All doubt can, however, easily be removed, in places where installation is not customary, by the simple method of dispensing from it, and it is the practice of some Ordinaries always to add a phrase to this effect in the letters of appointment.

E. J. M.

ABLUTIONS AND EUCHARISTIC FAST

A priest has obtained an indult enabling him to take some liquid nourishment before Mass. Should he or should he not take the ablutions at the first Mass when duplicating? (E. O.)

REPLY

S. Officii Declaratio, 2-3 May, 1923: Supremae Congregationi S. Officii propositum fuit quæsitum: "An sacerdotes dispensati a ieiunio eucharistico ante secundam missam, sumere possint ablutionem in prima." Et S. Congregatio, feria iv, die 2 Maii 1923, respondentum mandavit: *Affirmative*. Insequentia vero feria v, etc. . . . Romæ, die 16 Nov., 1922.

The conditions which must be verified before an indult for the non-fasting celebration of Mass will be granted by the Holy See were explained by the Holy Office, 22 March, 1923, and 1 July, 1931.¹ The above declaration was called for, firstly, because of the doubt arising from the prohibition of alcoholic liquids which is always contained in the indult; secondly, because of the necessity of avoiding scandal to the faithful. For both of these reasons it would appear that the ablutions should not be taken: wine is forbidden by the indult, and the more observant members of the congregation are accustomed to seeing a priest who is duplicating refrain from taking the ablutions at the first Mass.

The Holy Office, nevertheless, has given an affirmative answer to the question, and the reason can only be that the necessity of fully observing the rubrics of the Mass is held to be of greater importance than the above considerations. It will be noticed that the wording of the declaration is merely permissive—"possint" not "debeant"—but we agree with the writer in *Periodica*, 1922, XI, p. 144, that, since the appearance of the above declaration, there is an obligation to take the ablutions in such cases; the obstacle to the observance of the rubrics being removed, they not only may but should be observed; an indult is, indeed, a privilege which one is not bound to use, but a subsequent declaration which makes it possible to observe the rubrics is in no sense a privilege, and one should act in accordance with its provisions.

E. J. M.

¹Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1938, XV, p. 168.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

(i) SACRA PAENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA

DECRETUM : *Sacerdotibus, qui in Peculiaribus Custodiae locis detinentur, Facultas Conceditur Sacramentali Eorum Confessionem Audiendi, qui Iisdem in locis Quavis de Causa Commorantur (A.A.S. xxxi, 1941, p. 73).*

Ut facilius spirituali eorum saluti prospiciatur qui nunc temporis in peculiaribus custodiae locis a publica Auctoritate detinentur, Sacra Paenitentiaria Sacerdotibus, qui eamdem vitae rationem participant, Apostolica Auctoritate, concedit facultatem confessionem sacramentalem eorum omnium audiendi, qui vel in iisdem conditionibus versantur vel pro suo munere in iisdem locis commorantur, dummodo predicti Sacerdotes iurisdictionem ad confessiones excipiendas a proprio Ordinario iam habuerint neque eadem privati fuerint.

Facta autem de his relatione Ss̄mo Domino Nostro Pio div. Prov. Pp. XII ab infra scripto Cardinale Paenitentiario Maiore in Audientia diei 15 vertentis mensis, idem Ss̄mus Dominus Noster Decretum Sacrae Paenitentiariae approbavit, confirmavit et publicandum mandavit.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus S. Paenitentiariae, die 22 Februarii 1941.

L. Card. LAURI, *Paenitentiarius Maior.*

Priests in concentration camps normally enjoy no faculties for hearing confessions, apart from danger of death (Canon 882), unless jurisdiction is obtained from the local Ordinary (Canon 874). They are now given faculties for the purpose, on an analogy with Canon 883 (sacerdotes maritimum iter arripientes), provided they are already in possession of faculties from their own Ordinaries.

E. J. M.

(ii) SACRA PAENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA

DUBIUM : *Circa Absolutionem Generali Modo Impertiendam Militibus "Imminenti aut Commisso Proelio" (A.A.S. xxxii, 1940, p. 571).*

In Indice facultatum, quas Ss̄mus Dominus Noster Pius div. Prov. Pp. XII concessit pro tempore belli, et de quibus in *Acta Ap. Sedis*, a. 1939, p. 710 et sqq., legitur :

"Imminenti aut commissio proelio . . . liceat . . . Sacerdotibus absolvere a quibusvis peccatis et censuris quantumvis reservatis et notoriis, generali formula seu communis absolutione, absque praevia orali confessione, sed doloris actu debite emissio, quando sive prae militum multitudine sive prae temporis angustia singuli audiri nequeant."

Iamvero quaesitum est : Quid faciendum si aliquando circumstantiae tales sint ut praevideatur moraliter impossibile aut valde difficile fore ut milites turmatim absolvi possint "imminenti aut commissio proelio"?

Sacra Paenitentiaria Apostolica, omnibus mature perpensis, respondendum censuit : In praedictis circumstantiis, iuxta Theologiae moralis principia, licet, statim ac necessarium iudicabitur, milites turmatim absolvare. Sacerdotes autem sic absolventes ne omittant paenitentes docere absolutionem ita receptam non esse profuturam, nisi rite dispositi fuerint eidemque obligationem manere integrum confessionem suo tempore peragendi.

Facta autem de praemissis relatione Ss̄mo Domino Nostro Pio div. Prov. Pp. XII ab infra scripto Cardinali Paenitentiario Maiore in Audientia diei 7 vertentis mensis, idem Ss̄mus Dominus resolutionem Sacrae Paenitentiariae approbavit, confirmavit et publicandam mandavit.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus Sacrae Paenitentiariae, die 10 Decembris 1940.

L. Card. LAURI, *Paenitentiarius Maior.*

The text of the faculties obtainable by Army Chaplains, together with a commentary thereon, is in this REVIEW, Vol. XVIII, 1940, p. 304. The above declaration amplifies n. 14 of these faculties which, as we pointed out, may be used, when necessary, not merely by those under the jurisdiction of the Army Ordinary, but by all priests.

E. J. M.

(iii) **SACRA CONGREGATIO DE DISCIPLINA SACRAMENTORUM**

HORTATIO : *De Instructione, die 26 Mensis Maii 1938 Data, Studiosius Servanda* (*A.A.S. xxxiiii, 1941, p. 52*).

Quanta sollicitudine Ordinarii locorum ab edita huius S. Congregationis Instructione de sedulo custodienda SS. Eucharistia operam dederint ut in ea contentae praescriptiones sacerdotibus utriusque cleri innotescerent et ab iisdem executioni mandarentur, hanc eandem S. Congregationem non utique latet.

Attamen, quo vigilantius etiam Sacratissimus hic vitae Panis ab omni defendatur iniuria, huic sacro Dicasterio supervacaneum visum non est eosdem Ordinarios denuo hortari ne graventur parochos ecclesiarumque rectores omnes iterum monere ut, sollicitudine aucta, quae per praefatam Instructionem praescriptiones editae sunt sedulo planeque observent.

Quod si nihil secius furtum aliquod sacrilegum infeliciter perpetratum forte fuerit, numquam prorsus omittant Ordinarii ipsi processum oeconomicum, de quo in dicta Instructione (n. 10, litt. b), illico conficere, actaque omnia dein huic S. Congregationi deferre.

Romae, ex aedibus S. C. de Disciplina Sacramentorum, die 10 Februarii 1941.

D. Card. JORIO, *Praefectus.*

The *Instruction* referred to was printed in this REVIEW, Vol. XV, 1938, p. 170. An example of the application of section 10 (b) may be seen in Vol. XX, 1941, p. 89, and it is further explained in answering a question, Vol. XX, 1941, p. 358. Owing to the importance of the new regulations, and the sanctions to be applied to priests who neglect them, the Sacred Congregation has adopted the unusual course of exhorting all concerned to observe strictly the new laws regulating the custody of the Holy Eucharist.

E. J. M.

(iv) **SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII**

DECRETUM : *De Directa Insontium Occisione ex Mandato Auctoritatis Publicae Peragenda* (*A.A.S. xxxii, 1940, p. 553*).

Quaesitum est ab hac Suprema Sacra Congregatione: "Num licitum sit, ex mandato auctoritatis publicae, directe occidere eos qui, quamvis

nullum crimen morte dignum commiserint, tamen ob defectus psychi vel physicos nationi prodesse iam non valent, eamque potius graviusque vigori ac robori obstare censentur."

In generali concessu Supremae Sacrae Congregationis Sancti Officii habitu feria IV, die 27 Novembris 1940, Emī ac Revmī DD. Cardini rebus fidei ac morum tutandis praepositi, auditio RR. DD. Consultor voto, respondendum mandarunt :

Negative, cum sit iuri naturali ac divino positivo contrarium.

Et sequenti die dominica, 1 Decembris eiusdem anni, Ss̄mūs D. Pius divina Providentia Papa XII, in solita audiencia Exc. D. Adsess. S. Officii impertita, hanc relatum Sibi Eñorum Patrum resolutione adprobavit, confirmavit et publicari iussit.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus Sancti Officii, die 2 Decembris 1940.

ROMULUS PANTANETTI, *Supremae S. Congr. S. Officii Notarius.*

Since it is already well known that the Church forbids euthanasia—"mercy killing"—this further condemnation might appear, at first sight to be quite unnecessary. Euthanasia, however, is usually understood as a method of relieving an individual from pain; it is for the private good of the patient and performed at his request or at the request of nearest relatives. If it may not be done with the victim's consent, *a fortiori* it is forbidden without his consent, and the above document makes it quite clear that the public or state benefit, which it is hoped to obtain thereby, does not justify such action. Similarly, eugenic sterilization is unlawful, whether performed on private or public authority. Cf. *Catholic Bulletin of Foreign News*, 18 January, 22 February, 19 April, 10 May, 1941 (*Ministry of Information*), containing reports that 85,000 Germans have been put to death during three months of 1940. Without giving too much credence to atrocious stories, which always accumulate during time of war, it is evident that the Holy Office would not officially condemn a practice which is nonexistent, and we know of no country, except Germany, to which this condemnation can apply.

E. J. M.

(v) SUPREMA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII

Proscriptio Librorum

As intimated in this journal, 1940, XIX, p. 268, we can now give a list of the books placed on the Index by the Holy Office during 1940:

Edmundus Fleg, *L'enfant prophète*.

Edmundus Fleg, *Jésus raconté par le juif errant* (A.A.S. xxxii, 1940, p. 120). Carolus Pelz, *Der Christ als Christus* (ib. p. 502).

Dain Cohenel (pseudonimous Sac. Dolindi Ruotolo), *La Sacra Scrittura Psicologia, Commento, Meditazione* (ib. p. 553).

(vi) SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII NOTIFICATIO (A.A.S. xxxi, 1941, p. 69).

Suprema S. Congregatio Sancti Officii, attento etiam Decreto die 1 Maii 1937 edito "De novis cultus seu devotionis formis non introducendi

psychia
is grave
cti Offi
Cardina
nsulter
hus D.
Adsess
olution
940.
rius.
thanasi
first sig
erstood
vate go
near re
it is f
quite cl
reby, de
l, whet
of For
of Infor
ath dur
o atroc
ident th
ch is ne
which t
J. M.
give a b
p. 120).
i Scriptu
(A.A.
to die:
oducend
de que inolitis in re abusibus tollendis" (Cfr. *A.A.S.*, 1937, pp. 304-305), associationem "La Crociata Mariana" prohibuit, primitus in Pratensi erectam, et iam anno 1937 ab Etruria Episcopis pro dioecesis illius regionis proscriptam. (Cfr. *L'Osservatore Romano*, diei 31 Julii a. 1937).

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus Sancti Officii, die 8 Martii 1941.

ROMULUS PANTANETTI, *Sup. S. Congr. S. Officii Notarius.*

We have no information about this recently condemned devotion. Other examples may be seen in CLERGY REVIEW, 1940, xviii, p. 458. Cf. also an article on the subject by Fr. Crehan, S.J., 1940, xix, p. 407. For the 1937 decree cf. 1937, xiii, p. 315.

E. J. M.

(vii) SACRA CONGREGATIO PRO ECCLESIA ORIENTALI

(i) DECRETUM. *Pro Spirituali Administratione Ordinariatum Graeco-Ruthenorum in Foederatis Civitatibus Americae Septentrionalis.* (*A.A.S.* xxxiii, 1941, p. 27.)

Per Decretum "Cum data fuerit", die 1 m. Martii a. 1929, a S. Congregatione pro Ecclesia Orientali datum, *spirituali administrationi Ordinariatum Graeco-Ruthenorum in Foederatis Civitatibus Americae Septentrionalis* provisum fuit ad decennium. Cum vero, omnibus perspectis, decennali experientia compertum sit huiusmodi decretum vitae religiosae fidelium illarum regionum valde profuisse, S. haec Congregatio, praehabitis votis Excm̄orum P. D. Hamleti Ioannis Cicognani, Archiepiscopi tit. Laodicensis in Phrygia, in iisdem Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis Civitatibus Delegati Apostolici, P. D. Basilii Takacs, Episcopi tit. Zeliteni ac Apostolici Exarchae pro Ruthenis e Podcarpathia, nec non P. D. Constantini Bohacewskyj, Episcopi tit. Amiseni ac Apostolici Exarchae pro Ruthenis e Galitia, paucis, quae sequuntur, mutatis vel additis, illud ad aliud decennium confirmare statuit.

Art. 15.—Omnes rectores paroeciarum et missionum graeco-ruthenarum in Foederatis Civitatibus nominantur per Decretum proprii Ordinarii graeco-rutheni ritus, excluso quovis laicorum interventu. Idem amovibiles sunt (*ad nutum Ordinariorum graeco-rutheni ritus.* *Amoveri autem non poterunt absque causis gravibus et instis.*)

Art. 39.—(*Matrimonia tum inter fideles graeco-ruthenos, tum inter fideles mixti ritus, servata forma decreti "Ne temere" contrahendi debent, ac proinde in ritu mulieris a parocho mulieris benedicenda sunt.*) Quod si iusta causa adsit, poterunt nuptiae celebrari in ritu viri, de iudicio et de consensu Ordinarii loci.

Quac omnia, in Audientia diei 23 mensis Novembris a. 1940, referente infrascripto Cardinali a secretis, Ss̄mus D. N. Pius div. Prov. Pp. XII probavit ac rata habuit, simul iubens per Decretum S. C. pro Ecclesia Orientali publici iuris fieri.

Contrariis quibuslibet minime obfuturis.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus S. Congregationis pro Ecclesia Orientali, die 23 mensis Novembris a. 1940.

E. CARD. TISSERANT, *a Secretis.*

(ii) DECRETUM. *Facultas Concedendi Transitum ad Alium Ritum Deinceps uni S. Sedi Reservatur.* (*A.A.S.* xxxiii, 1941, p. 28.)

Quo firmior teneatur disciplina de cuiusvis fidelis ad nativum ritum

pertinentia, Ss̄mus D. N. Pius div. Prov. Pp. XII, in Audientia dici 23 mensis Novembris anno 1940, referente infrascripto Cardinali a secretis, statuerunt dignatus est facultatem transeundi ab uno ad alium ritum a S. Sede tantum esse concedendam.

Cessat igitur facultas qua fruebantur Nuntii ac Delegati Apostolici e Decreto "Nemini licere", die 6 mensis Decembris, anno 1928 dato (Cf. A.A.S., 1928, p. 416), atque huic S. Congregationi directe reservatur iudicium de iis omnibus quae referuntur ad transitum ab uno ad alium ritum sive de clericis sive de fidelibus agatur.

Contrariis quibuslibet minime obfuturis.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus S. Congregationis pro Ecclesia Orientali die 23 mensis Novembris anno 1940.

E. CARD. TISSERANT, *a Secretis.*

(viii) SACRA CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS

DECRETO: *Circa la Giurisdizione Dell'Ordinario Militare in Italia.*
(A.A.S., xxxii, 1940, p. 280.)

L'Ordinario militare ed i cappellani militari in Italia godono della giurisdizione spirituale sulle truppe di terra, di mare e di aria, con competenza parrocchiali (*Concordato*, art. 14). Poichè, però, tale giurisdizione si esercita nel territorio delle diocesi, questa S. C. Concistoriale, con l'approvazione di Sua Santità Pio Pp. XII, allo scopo di coordinare la giurisdizione medesima con quella degli Ordinari diocesani ed eliminare le eventuali interferenze, ha dichiarato e stabilito quanto segue:

(1) La giurisdizione dell'Ordinario militare e dei cappellani militari in Italia è personale. Essa si estende a tutti i militari di terra, di mare e di aria, ed anche al personale religioso maschile e femminile addetto agli ospedali militari; sono escluse, invece, le persone civili in qualunque modo appartenenti ai militari o addette all'esercito.

(2) La giurisdizione di cui sopra è cumulativa con quella degli Ordinari diocesani: però nei luoghi destinati ai militari (*caserme, aeroporti, arsenali militari, sedi di comandi, scuole militari, ospedali militari, tribunali e carceri militari ecc.*, escluse quindi le abitazioni private dei militari fuori di detti luoghi destinati ai militari), ve la esercitano primeramente e principalmente l'Ordinario e i cappellani militari; secondariamente, sempre però *in proprio*, gli Ordinari diocesani e i parroci locali, nei casi di mancanza o d'assenza di detto Ordinario e cappellani militari, e presi di regola gli opportuni accordi con l'Ordinario militare, nonché con le competenti Autorità militari.

(3) Fuori dei luoghi sopra segnalati gli Ordinari diocesani ed i parroci locali eserciteranno liberamente la loro giurisdizione sui singoli militari, tutte le volte che ne verranno richiesti.

(4) La benedizione degli stessi luoghi, nel Sabato Santo, sarà data da cappellani militari, salvò il diritto dei parroci locali quando i cappellani mancassero, e salvo gli opportuni accordi di cui all'art. 2.

(5) La benedizione delle navi verrà impartita dall'Ordinario militare quando la cerimonia del varo sarà indetta dall'Autorità militare: che se l'Ordinario militare sarà impedito, questi ne darà avviso all'Ordinario diocesano, il quale la impartirà *in re proprio*. Quando invece detta cerimonia

si compirà per iniziativa privata o di altra Autorità non militare, la benedizione rimarrà nelle competenza dell'Ordinario diocesano.

(6) I cappellani militari, quando per l'esercizio delle funzioni inerenti al loro sacro ministero rispetto ai militari avranno da ufficiare in chiese non proprie o non destinate ad essi abitualmente, si rivolgeranno previamente agli Ordinari diocesani o ai parroci o rettori locali per le opportune intese.

(7) Per ciò che riguarda l'assistenza ai matrimoni, i cappellani militari avranno presente il prescritto del Can. 1097 §2 del *Codice di D. C.*, secondo il quale "pro regula habeatur ut matrimonium coram sponsae parocho celebretur, nisi insta causa excusat", e in caso che essi assistano al rito si atterranno particolarmente, oltre che a tutte le altre disposizioni canoniche, a quelle stabilite nel can. 1103, §§ 1 e 2.

(8) Gli stessi cappellani militari sono sottoposti, come sacerdoti e ratione loci, anche alla disciplina e vigilanza degli Ordinari diocesani, i quali in casi urgenti potranno anche adottare a loro riguardo i provvedimenti canonici che stimeranno opportuni, salvo avvertirne subito l'Ordinario militare.

Roma, dalla S. C. Concistoriale, 13 Aprile 1940.

Fr. R. C. Card. Rossi, *segretario.*

(ix) SACRA CONGREGATIO DE PROAGANDA FIDE

DECRETUM. *De Iuramento Super Ritibus Malabaricis a Missionariis in Indiis Orientalibus Praestando.* (A.A.S. xxxii, 1940, p. 379.)

Super dubium: "Utrum, abolito iuramento super ritibus sinensibus, opportunum sit dispensare etiam missionarios in Indiis Orientalibus a iuramento super ritibus malabaricis" Eminentissimi ac Reverendissimi Patres huic Sacro Consilio Christiano Nomini Propagando praepositi, in plenariis comitiis die 8 decurrentis mensis Aprilis habitis, respondendum censuerunt:

Affirmative, firma obligatione de cetero observandi praescripta Benedicti XIV, quatenus a Sancta Sede non immutata.

Quam Emorum Patrum sententiam Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Pio Div. Prov. Papae XII, ab infrascripto huius Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Secretario, in Audientia hodierna die relatam, Sanctitas Sua in omnibus dignata est adprobare et ratam habere, ac praesens super re decretum edi iussit.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, die 9 mensis Aprilis, A.D. 1940.

P. Card. FUMASONI BIONDI, *Praefectus.*

The Instruction of *Propaganda*, 8 December, 1939 (Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1940, xix, p. 77), in recognizing the lawfulness of certain rites which it is customary in China to observe, declared that the oath which missionaries had to take, pledging themselves not to tolerate Christians sharing in these rites, was now superfluous, "sive in Sinis, sive alibi illud in usu esset". The doubt whether this included certain rites in Malabar is now removed.

E. J. M.

CHURCH MANAGEMENT
CONGREGATIONAL SINGING

THERE are parishes where on all occasions the singing is strictly reserved to trained choirs, and the faithful "in the middle of the church" are never given a chance to raise their voices. On the other hand, there are priests who are scornful of choirs, never allow so much as a Missa Cantata, and for the necessary singing at evening services depend upon the ragged efforts of a scattered congregation.

The ideal for the ordinary parish church lies somewhere between these extremes. A choir is desirable for liturgical singing, and is useful for leading variable Masses. To be able to exclude the faithful from singing is to inflict upon them a hardship as unreasonable as that of habitually depriving them of the joy of a sung Mass. They like to sing and should be encouraged. But congregational singing to the exclusion of everything else can be boringly monotonous, solemn and here again a choir is helpful to give a touch of relief from time to time by way of harmonized music.

Unison singing on the part of the congregation is mainly a matter which concerns evening services. Hearty hymn-singing has a stirring effect upon a congregation; it stimulates a community feeling, and disposes them to pay better attention to the devotions and the sermon. Catholics, especially converts, who are deprived of singing are inclined to be envious when in passing a non-Catholic place of worship they hear fine swelling strains of hymn-singing within. A reputation for good congregational singing shares the attractiveness of a reputation for good preaching. The more hymn-singing the better. The evening service is admittedly one of our minor problems. On all sides we hear complaints of poor attendance. Our evening service is, of course, an anomaly which has no counterpart in Catholic countries. It would appear to be a mid-Victorian institution set up as a kind of off-set to the popular evening services of Protestantism. It is significant that in the Laity's Directory of 1831 the list of Sunday offices at every church in London and the suburbs ends with Vespers at three or four in the afternoon followed by a short instruction. However, we have to face the fact that the evening service is an institution and that any attempt to discontinue it would awaken loud protests, and perhaps especially on the part of those who rarely or never attend.

It is sometimes objected that in the average church the repertory of hymns is painfully meagre, the same half-dozen reshuffled being made to do duty Sunday after Sunday. The complaint is not unfounded but the remedy is simple enough. We are not tied to the use of any particular hymnal but whatever book we prefer must surely contain a sufficiently rich variety to allow of frequent change. We should take the trouble to search out new hymns, and, what is more important, to teach the people. If a new hymn were taught once or twice a month we should soon have a plentiful collection. We need not deprive our people of the well-worn old favourites; poor though they may be in artistic value they are rich in pious associations, and hymn-singing is not an academic exhibition.

If it were announced with the notices on Sunday morning that a new hymn would be taught at the evening service, many would be attracted out of mere curiosity. The priest himself should do the teaching. From the pulpit he should read out the first verse several times; then, accompanied by the organ he should sing it. After a few repetitions he should invite the people to join with him, and then induce them to sing the remaining verses by themselves. If his qualities as a songster are not equal to those of the choir, then he might content himself with the reading, and leave the depend singing to a competent member of the choir. It will be found that the faithful enjoy this kind of Sunday evening exercise, and that they take more interest in these if taught by their priest. Congregations left to themselves in-leading variably glide into a bad habit of drawling; from time to time they should be admonished to sing cheerfully, without unbecoming haste, and the priest should set an example. It is a commendable practice to conclude a sung the evening service with a hymn¹ as a recessional, and a procession back national to the sacristy, down the centre of the church, makes an impressive and sonorous, solemn finale.

J. P. R.

¹ A hymn to Our Lord or the Blessed Sacrament may be substituted for the *Adoremus*. Other hymns may not be begun until the door of the tabernacle has been shut.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE PREFACE OF THE APOSTLES

Dom Gregory Swann, O. S. B., writes :

Possibly you may think the following liturgical note of sufficient interest to be published in THE CLERGY REVIEW.

Some time ago I began to think how anomalous the Preface of the Apostles was in omitting the usual thanksgiving phrase, *nos tibi semper ubique gratias agere*. Then it occurred to me that in the text of the Sacramentaries the prefices are nearly always abbreviated, and that possibly the form of this preface now found in the Roman Missal is due to an oversight.

On a recent visit to Ampleforth I discovered that undoubtedly the thanksgiving phrase was originally in the Preface of the Apostles, as the following extracts show :

Leonine Sacramentary, 340

Vere digni qui ecclesiam tuam sempiterna pietate non deserens per apostolos tuos jugiter eam et eridis et protegis per . . .

Gelasian Sacramentary, 656

V D. Suppliciter exorantes ut gregem tuum Pastor aeterne non deseret et per beatos apostolos continua protectione custodias, ut iisdem rectoribus dirigantur quos operis tui vicarios iisdem contulisti praesesse pastores. Per . . .

Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury (ed. Martin Rule, 1896), p. 41

Aeterne Deus. Et te, Domine, suppliciter exorare, ut gregem tuum pastor aeterne, non deseras, sed . . .

Sarum Missal (1526)

Vere dignum et justum est, aequum et salutare, nos tibi semper ubique gratias agere, Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, aeterne Deus. Et te, Domine, suppliciter exorare, ut gregem tuum, pastor aeterne, non deseras, sed per beatos apostolos tuos continua protectione custodias. Ut iisdem rectoribus gubernetur, quos operis tui vicarios eidem contulisti praesesse pastores. Et ideo cum Angelis . . .

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

sufficie

ce of the
semper
the Sac
possibly t
ersight.
citedly th
ers, as th

rens po

desera
ectoribus
pastore

), p. 41
m tuum

emper
ne Deu
rne, no
ustodias
contulis